UNITAS

(Peekskill, N.Y.)

"Clamat Ecclesia ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."
— S. Augustine.

GREEK CATHOLIC UNION 1962

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Association *Unitas*

English Language Edition

harles A. Boyer, S.J.: The Amsterdam Assembly and the Ecumenical Movement.

Frederic Tailliez, S.J.: The Rumanians and the Drama of the Greek Catholic Church.

Joseph dalla Torre: The Repercussions of the Religious Breach upon the Destinies of Europe.

J. Gill, S.J.: Resumé of the Eighth Lambeth Conference, 1948.

Martin Jugie, A.A.: Will Union Be Easy for the Orientals?

NOTES and INFORMATION: Unity; —— Chronicle; —— Around the World; —— The Oriental Church.

BOOK NOTES.

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
RIVER FOREST, ILLINOIS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

VOLUME 1 JANUARY-MARCH, 1949 NUMBER 1

v.1-2
1949-
50

Nihil obstat:

Charles Boyer, S.J.,

censor deputatus

Imprimatur:

✠*Aloysius Traglia*

Archiepūs Caesarien. Vicegerens.

Ex Vicariatu Urbis, die 9 iv '49.

The Amsterdam Assembly and the Ecumenical Movement

Two great assemblies of Christians separated from the Church of Rome took place last summer. From July 1 to August 8 the conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Church was held at London in the library of the Palace of Lambeth, and the first Assembly of the Ecumenical Council of Churches gathered at Amsterdam from August 22 to September 4. The reader will find an account of the Lambeth Conference in another article of this review. It has seemed fit to present here a rather lengthy treatment of the Amsterdam Conference for the UNITAS readers. I shall strive first, then, to give a precise notion of the nature of the work of the Assembly and derive some conclusions from the Catholic point of view.

Let us first identify the Assembly, using data given by members of long standing in the ecumenical movement. One should look for the origin of this movement in an international missionary conference held at Edinburgh in 1910. The missionaries were the first among the Protestants to sense the obstacle which their divisions raised against their efforts, and they sought to unite among themselves. Charles Henry Brent, then Episcopalian Bishop of the Philippines, was among the members of the conference. His thought passed in one leap from the dream of missionary unity to that of universal unity, and that same year, 1910, in a convention of his diocesans at Cincinnati, he proposed the idea of a world conference to which all Christian faiths would be invited. The results are known: the favorable attitude, but also the refusal, of Benedict XV; the formation of the two groups, one doctrinal, that of Brent (Faith and Order), and the other of action (Work and Life), of the Swedish Archbishop of Upsala, Nathan Söderblom; the conferences of Stockholm (1925) with its Christian social program, and of Lausanne (1927) where doctrinal disagreement came to the fore; finally, the year 1937 saw a fusion of the active movement assembled at Oxford and the doctrinal movement assembled at Edinburgh without the destruction of either.

M. Boegner has told how fifteen days after the conference of Edinburgh seven delegates of Oxford met with seven delegates of Edinburgh at the Hotel Victoria in London and how they prepared a meeting which took place in 1939 at Utrecht. There under the presidency of William Temple, then Archbishop of York, and later of Canterbury, the creation of the World Council of Churches was decided, and the provisional Committee, charged with organizing for 1941 the Assembly of delegates of all the adherents of the Council. It is this Assembly, impeded by the war in 1941, which finally was held at Amsterdam.

There was no delegate nor any observer from the Catholic Church. The synod which had just been held at Moscow had also refused any participation. The synod accused the Council of seeking ends which were "essentially political, anti-democratic, and non-ecclesiastical." One should note that the

341949

resolutions of this synod were only signed by representatives of the churches which exist under the dependence of Soviet Russia, and by one sole Metropolitan in the name of the patriarchs of Alexandria and of Antioch.

Despite the absence of these two great bodies the Assembly remained an imposing one: 43 nations were represented. About 148 denominations had sent delegates. The members present probably counted more than fifteen hundred (450 delegates; 450 substitutes, representatives of other associations, and guests). Among the delegates, a number of famous names attracted attention, such as Barth, Boegner, Niemöller, Mott, Brunner, Bell, Visser 'tHooft and Niebuhr.

The Assembly faced a well defined task. The general subject, *Man's Disorder and God's Design,* on the one hand permitted an analysis of the evil which humanity suffers at the present time, and on the other hand a search for the remedy in the knowledge and the acceptance of the Will of God. To study this, the Assembly was divided into four sections which examined respectively: (1) The universal Church in God's design. (2) The Church's witness to God's design. (3) The Church and the disorder of society. (4) The Church and international disorder.

Consequently, some sessions were plenary and others partial, according to sections. We shall pass immediately to the results achieved by the sections: They represent, in fact, the work accomplished in the conference proper, while the discourses delivered in the plenary sessions will lead us rather to understand the permanent intentions of the movement.

The members of the first session (cf. Ecumenical Press Service n. 39, Sept. 15, 1948) at which Bishop Hans Lilje presided and in which were found together Karl Barth and George Florovsky, were to deal with the subject of the universal Church. They recognized a unity among themselves which consisted in their "relation with the Head and the Lord of the Church." But they also affirmed their disagreement, which they defined as existing "between Catholics and Protestants," understanding as Catholics those who believe in the "visible continuity of the Church," and in "apostolic and episcopal succession," as are, for instance, the separated Orientals and the Anglicans, and understanding as Protestants those who do not believe in the visible Church, but in the "initiative of the Word of God" and in the "justification by faith alone." Visible or invisible, the Church has for its mission the preaching of the Gospel. The creation of the World Council of the Churches took place because "the Churches are responsible for each other."

The second session affirms that evangelization has not been sufficiently attentive to the concrete needs of humanity; for example, it has not been brought to speak of the subject of warfare. A call is made to laymen to put themselves to work, first in the family, then wherever they carry on their daily work. An invitation is made for collaboration and union. "God grants

His grace even to the separated Churches. Nevertheless, we are persuaded that He holds in reserve even more extraordinary gifts for a Church united in conformity with His Will."

The résumé which the EPS gives of the report of the Third Session on *The Church and the disorder of society* resembles closely the conclusions which a Catholic social week might produce. Maintenance of the right of property, dignity of the person; safeguard of liberties; the family, the social unit; the interest of the Church in the condition of the proletariat; the abuses of capitalism; and the elimination of social barriers. Let us note well this recommendation: "The Churches ought to declare directly and publicly from time to time what they conceive to be the Will of God in regard to public questions of the moment."

We select certain points from the conclusions of the Fourth Section on the international problem. The traditional notion of a just war is here brought into question. The members of the Section were, nevertheless, unable to reach a unanimous agreement when they dealt with the question whether a war could be an act of justice today. The nations ought to renounce a large part of their sovereignty. "It is a duty of Christians to pray for all men and especially for those who are clothed with authority , and to combat all hatred and all resignation to warfare." Here are certain wishes, or practical recommendations: To give priority of material and spiritual aid to refugees, to work for the adoption of a declaration of the rights of man, and to uphold the adoption of other conventions relative to human rights. The same Section proposed a declaration on religious liberty.

Finally, the members of the Assembly addressed a message "to our brothers in Christ and to all who" they say, "are willing to hear." This message is a noble document in which a profound religious sentiment is expressed in the classical framework imposed by the ideas of the Reform: humble confession of past faults, remembrance of the goodness of God and of the work of Jesus Christ, an act of faith confiding in Him and the resolution of a more exact obedience to His desires. More than one clue indicates the influence of Karl Barth.

With the termination of the Assembly, the Central Committee of the Ecumenical Council remains, composed of 65 representatives whose president is Dr. G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester. W. A. Visser 't Hooft was re-elected Secretary General of the Ecumenical Council. The next Assembly will be held in 1953 in the United States.

A quarterly review edited in English, *The Ecumenical Review,* is published under the auspices of the Council. It asks its readers to consider it "not simply as an interesting record of events and tendencies of thought in the ecumenical world, but as a common spiritual adventure leading to unexpected and surprising discoveries."

Neither the nature nor the rôle of the Council during its formation

have been modified, now that it has been definitely established. It serves the Churches, but it ought to abstain from controlling or directing them. Visser 'tHooft had already explained it, just as UNITAS then made it known to its readers (UNITAS, II, 1947, pp. 189-194, *Réflexions sur le Conseil oecuménique*). The Council is not then an authority. It is rather a representation of the various denominations. If it wishes to work for unity, it cannot do this except through persuasion, and then, apparently, by the action of its organs of studies.

The Council has no political function. This has been affirmed forcibly against the accusations of Moscow. Even so, the Protestant communities are so important on the one hand in England and in the United States—such very powerful states politically—and on the other hand the bond is so strong between certain Christian principles and political action, that it is inevitable that the Council, through the messages it proposes to deliver from time to time for the common good, should not exercise a political influence. As a matter of fact, Mr. John Foster Dulles, Counselor on Foreign Policy for Mr. Dewey, has denounced Communism, founded upon violence and coercion, as opposed to the exigencies of human nature, while a Communist sympathizer coming from Prague, Dr. Hromadka, has proclaimed the benefits that Communism, even though atheistic, bestows upon religion, at the same time acknowledging that he himself could one day go to prison when the policy should require it. . . .

And now what judgment should we make upon an event whose importance it would be unjust to misunderstand, either in the religious domain or in the political domain, since it is a very difficult thing for a great religious event not to make its impact upon both one and the other?

The first result is that the Ecumenical Council of Churches is definitely constituted. Since 1938, without doubt, it had a certain existence, but it is only at Amsterdam that an Assembly of representatives of the diverse denominations has confirmed it.

A second effect follows. The communities which belong to the Ecumenical Council are from now on in a position to collaborate among themselves for common ends. Should it have to do, for example, with assistance to refugees so numerous in this post-war period, or should it have to do with missions, or even with the support of needy communities, the organism now exists which can assume such duties and carry them out efficaciously. It is to be hoped that this new force will not be employed for Protestant propaganda in Catholic countries: this would be contrary to the ecumenical spirit and could only augment the tension among Christians without even producing the illusion of religious profit. In fact, it is acknowledged that Catholics who renounce their faith change most frequently to indifferentism or even to irreligion.

And now a third positive result. The preoccupation and the desire for

unity have now taken form in a lasting organization of which they are the whole *raison d'être*. The time will not come again when Christians separated from the Church of Rome will accept without regret this separation along with the increasingly numerous divisions which spring up among them. Who can say if that which is born of a union will not be transformed and prepare for a new growth of the Body of Christ? Once aroused in the heart of sincere believers, the aspiration for unity will allow them no rest until, after having perhaps embraced various phantoms, they will finally find true unity.

How far has this unity been advanced at Amsterdam? I should like to give to this question a reply which does not exaggerate either the hopes or the difficulties. If it were too pessimistic, it would be unjust in view of the effort expended, and would be discouraging for future action. If it were too optimistic it would promote illusions and prepare the way for disastrous disappointments. We shall try, then, to be exact.

It is an important fact that the directors of the ecumenical movement do not renounce the end for which the movement was created—that they do not intend to be contented with the collaboration of their churches, and that they aspire to unity in one and the same faith. The Secretary General of the Ecumenical Council, Dr. Visser 'tHooft, has declared most explicitly that "it is not sufficient to collaborate" and that "one of the first obligations of the Council is to call the Churches to meet one another in conferences to study their differences in matters of faith and constitution, and to study means of uniting their churches completely." According to Pastor Boegner, one of the presidents of the Council, this Council should be "the prophet of unity." Dr. Brilioth of the Swedish Church, Bishop of Växjö, speaks of "the vision of the Church, one, holy, catholic and apostolic."

Yet the unity which remains their ideal is quite the same as we define it, that is to say, that which results from the profession of one and the same faith.

It is indeed that unity which Pastor Boegner, as we have said in these pages (UNITAS, December, 1947), understands was taught by Jesus Christ in the Gospel; it is indeed of this unity that Visser 'tHooft speaks when he evokes the evangelical image of one sole flock and one sole pastor.

But the purer the ideal, the more the evidence of experience contrasts with it. The delegates of the Amsterdam Assembly have felt profoundly how far they are from the unity they dreamed of. Separated from the great Catholic Church, of which not one member was among them, held apart by the Oriental churches controlled by Moscow, how could they have attempted to represent the whole Church of Christ? Even without leaving the Assembly, between the walls of the Concertgebow, what essential division keeps them at a distance from one another! Between a Karl Barth who admits no hierarchy, and who sets himself against the cult of the Holy Virgin, and a George Florovsky, attached to the doctrine of the Seven First Councils, to the Holy

Synod and to the cult of the Mother of God, what agreement can exist? From every side, and following upon the lead of the same Karl Barth, the impossibility of celebrating together the Eucharist, the sacrament of unity, by the members of the Assembly was pointed out as a scandal. Four services had to be organized. They were much more separated by their intrinsic nature than by the distance of the churches in which they were celebrated. The Orthodox who possess the Eucharist, like the Catholics, did not admit anyone but Orthodox to the Communion; the Anglicans, admitted besides the Anglicans, those with whom they have intercommunion; the Lutherans accepted all those who desired to receive the Body and the Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that is to say, those who believe in the real presence; finally, the Reformed Church of Holland admitted all those who, having been baptized, communicate in their own churches. This painful spectacle of division could doubtless have been avoided by not celebrating the Eucharist. But would it not have been another scandal, and a more grievous one, for an assembly of Christians to avoid the rite which lies at the center of Christian worship, and which one finds taking place in the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Didaché according to the word of the Lord, "Do this in remembrance of Me"?

This diversity in faith is moreover fully recognized and profoundly regretted by most of the "ecumenists." Those are rare who attempt to reduce it to a matter of the differences of opinion which exist among theologians in the midst of the Catholic Church. At Amsterdam the speakers often admitted that between the different denominations there is a matter of substantial opposition in matters of doctrine. They saw in this a reason for humiliating themselves and for confessing the culpability of their churches. At the time of the opening, Visser 'tHooft said in his report: "We ought not to exaggerate what we are: the real and marked divergences which separate us, divergencies which will appear during this Assembly; the absence of representatives of a large part of Christianity—so many reasons for making us humble." Pastor Boegner recalled the "grave doctrinal divergences" which separate Protestants since the very origins of the Reform, and he saw in this fact an "enormous" difficulty, and one which was even humanly insurmountable. The breach which separates a great number of Protestants from the dissident Orientals is even larger. That which the Synod of Moscow had just crudely recalled in demanding that the Reformed Christians accept the doctrine of the seven first Councils had been equivalently declared by the Orientals at the Conference of Lausanne: "We cannot conceive," they said, "a united Church in which some believe that the Scripture is the unique source of divine Revelation and others that Tradition is the indispensable complement of it. We do not understand how those can agree who say that the ministers of the Church have been instituted by the will of Christ and those who doubt if Christ instituted them Himself. We believe that a formula on the necessity of the Sacraments is useless, if fundamental divergences on

their number, their sense, their essential nature, their particular effects persist." (C. E., 1927, p. 1, 6.)

Is there at least in the Council a determined will to work for the elimination of substantial divergences in matters of faith? Perhaps it can be found among the members of the Faith and Order group, a group which maintains its autonomy in the Council and which will have its particular conferences. However, this will does not seem to exist among the greater number. On the contrary, each denomination seems to wish to defend its particularity; and whatever the case, the particularities persist. "The Orthodox," M. Boegner tells us, "become, if one might say so, more Orthodox, the Anglicans more Anglican, the Lutherans more Lutheran, the Reformed more reformed. Ecumenism is determining a rebirth of confessionalism." (*Le Problème de l'Unité Chrétienne*, p. 108, Paris, 1947.)

Before this manifest contrast between the ideal of unity and the reality of tenacious divisions, those who wish to save the *raison d'être* of ecumenism, which is nothing if it is not the search for unity in one and the same faith, relegate to the distant future and even to the end of time the accomplishment of the prayer of Christ that all His own become one. M. Boegner, after having insisted upon and exalted unity, makes of it an eschatological reality. Similarly, Visser 'tHooft at Amsterdam has placed the one flock "upon earth or in the heavens" and Dr. Brilioth has advanced it to the frontiers of time and eternity.

This despair of the most fervent workers of ecumenism is regrettable, not only from the doctrinal point of view, for it is not possible that Christ would have willed for His Church that which would never be realized, but also from the practical point of view, for one cannot seek seriously and with all his might that which he believes impossible to find. They would satisfy themselves, in fact, with a unity which permits separations to subsist. But is this not wishing to hold at one time two contradictories?

No matter what is done, the import of the ecumenical movement is thus diminished and its zeal dampened. One may still speak of participation in unity, of a fleeting apparition of the *Una Sancta*; but in reality one does not enjoy a community of thought and of sentiment excepting by reference to very general propositions. This is something, without doubt, but it is not unity, and if one stops here, he renounces unity.

In fact, the members of the Assembly of Amsterdam are in agreement only in the confession of Christ.[1] Again, this is much, but on the Church,

1) It must be recognized once more that the confession of Christ, as the statutes of the Council proclaim it and require it, that is, the confession of Christ as God and Saviour, has not only kept away a certain number of Protestant denominations from the ecumenical activity, but it has caused reservations among others, particularly among the Swiss communities, who, nevertheless are admitted to the Council. The Assembly of Amsterdam was obliged to take account of this situation, and it has decided that a commission should examine the modifications proposed, and should present a report on this subject at the next Congress. The *Schweizer Monatshefte*, from which we borrow our information (Heft. 7, October, 1948, Zurich, p. 459), are of the opinion, however, that if anything is modified, it will be in the direction of a more pronounced dogmatism. However they add, "the Council is not concerned with knowing in what manner the Churches interpret this formula." This means to say that the Council is powerless to defend that which is truly the basis and the foundation of Christianity: the divinity of Jesus Christ.

on the Priesthood, on the Sacraments, on the veneration of the Saints, on the conception of the future life, the fundamental divergences remain and the divisions are openly avowed. In the message delivered by the Assembly "to our brothers in Christ, and to all who are willing to hear us," unity is affirmed solely in the confession of Christ: "We Bless God our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ Who gathers together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad. He has brought us here together at Amsterdam. We are one in acknowledging Him as our God and Saviour." They do not ignore their divisions, but avow that these exist "in matters of faith, order and tradition."

This is the attitude which was adopted by the Ecumenical Assembly when it wished to define its proper nature and its rôle:

"The World Council of Churches is composed of Churches which acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. They find their unity in Him. Unity is not for them to create; it is the gift of God. But they know that it is their duty to make common cause in the search for the expression of that unity in work and in life. The Council desires to serve the Churches, which are its constituent members, as an instrument whereby they may bear witness together to their common allegiance to Jesus Christ, and cooperate in matters requiring united action. . . . It is the earnest desire of the Council that the Churches may be found closer to Christ and therefore closer to one another." (EPS no. 40, 1948)

Various expressions seem here also to bear the mark of the Swiss minister Karl Barth, whose influence is great. According to the degree to which this theologian is opposed to liberalism, one should rejoice in his action, but his ideas on natural knowledge, his theology of the Church and of her sacraments, are up to this time too negative to be able to lead the ecumenical movement toward true unity.

This text says well what it intends to say, and that is its will to collaborate with the confession of Christ serving as a bond. The Ecumenical idea promised more. It announced a revision of doctrines and of traditions to arrive at unity, not only in faith in Christ, but also in faith in all the doctrine and all the institutions of Christ. May the members of the Council who belong to the Faith and Order group not depart from their first intention, and may they persuade the Council of the necessity of working for doctrinal agreement!

May they reflect thoroughly upon this point. It has to do with a religious problem which is to belong to Christ and to continue His work in the way He willed it. This way is evidently the only way and it is in conforming themselves to it as they should that Christians will be one. The first duty of the one who wishes to be a Christian consists then in searching for what the will of Christ is. This is a question of doctrine.

It is noteworthy that the question of unity of doctrine, in this middle of the twentieth century, is posited in well-determined terms. To all appear-

ances, there is but one means of realizing it. If all of the delegates of Amsterdam would have come to an accord on a precise creed and if the Synod of Moscow and the Protestants who are hostile to the Council would have accepted this creed, and if this symbol should differ in one sole point from the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, unity would not have been achieved. There would still have been two blocs necessarily separated. The Catholic Church can change nothing of its doctrine: she has defined her own infallibility and that of her visible head the Pope in the most explicit terms. The only possibility of realizing the desire for ecumenism is then in the accepting by all those who wish unity of the integral *Credo* of the Roman church.

The Holy Father Pius XII has recently recalled this to the German Catholics assembled at Mainz. He did this in moving terms which, while confirming the prohibitions contained in the recent decree of the Holy Office, manifest his ardent desire of unity: "We know how urgent among many of your people, Catholics as well as non-Catholics, is the aspiration toward unity in the Faith. And who could feel more intensely this desire than the Vicar of Christ himself? The Church surrounds the dissidents from the Faith with 'sincere love' and with the warmth of prayers for the accomplishment of their return to their Mother, from whom God knows how many are distant without any personal guilt. If the Church is inflexible before all that could have even the appearance of a compromise, or of an adjustment of the Catholic Faith with other confessions, or of its mixture and confusion with them, it is because she knows that there has always been and always will be one sole infallible and sure rock of the whole truth and of the fullness of grace come to her from Christ; and that this rock, according to the explicit will of her divine Founder, is herself and simply herself." (Osservatore Romano, Nov. 9, 1948)

The Dutch Bishops in the magnificent Pastoral Letter which they published on the occasion of the Assembly of the World Council said in the same spirit that the Congress "will make a step ahead if the members of the Congress succeed in strengthening within themselves the movement toward the Mother Church and toward the unity which resides in her."

But this fact of unity which no one is able to modify brings with it a great light. Either Christ did not will and does not will the unity of His Church, or He wills that all His faithful belong to the Roman Catholic Church. After all, He is too wise to will the impossible and He is too powerful to permit that what He wills should be impossible. Is it not to be thought, on the contrary, that in willing His Church to be united in the Faith, He has taken the means of preserving it in this unity and that, consequently, He established forever an authority capable of excluding error and of defining truth? If at the conclusion of these reflections one remembers the words spoken in the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi: "Thou art

Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church. . . . Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." (Matt. 16,13-20) Or of those other words spoken on the banks of Lake Tiberias: "Feed My lambs. . . . Feed My sheep" (John 21, 15-17); and if one recognizes that only the Bishop of Rome has been recognized throughout history as the successor of Peter—do not all these converging rays cast a favorable light upon the tranquil assurance with which the Catholic Church proclaims herself the one and the true Church of Christ?

In one of the preparatory studies at the Amsterdam Assembly entitled *The Roman Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Movement,* K. E. Skydsgaard well understood the requirements of effective work toward unity. Between the polemical attitude which most frequently increases opposition, and the simply irenic attitude which leaves things as they are, he proposes an attitude of objective reflection. Conversation to be fruitful "demands," he says "a real effort and a study of the great fundamental doctrines: Holy Scripture and tradition, the Church and the minister, the Word and the Sacraments, Justification and Sanctification, the significance of the Gospel and of faith in Christ." It does not seem that this sort of view has prevailed in the midst of the Assembly. There is, nevertheless, in the Council, an organization of studies—it seems to me that the future of ecumenism depends upon its spirit and its activity.

It is obvious that we do not minimize the difficulties of unionistic labors. To what good entertaining illusions and arousing, as M. Boegner has said, "those terribly superficial hopes" to which the best intentioned of ecumenical reunions give birth?

However, I wish to repeat the profound reasons for hope which ought to sustain and promote the work for union. These reasons can only be fortified by the events of Amsterdam. First of all it is the "*Dieu le veut*" of the Crusades. Christ and His Church will it. Doubtless, we believe, we Catholics, that the prayer of Jesus for the union of His own (John 17,20) has been heard, as it could not now be heard, and that through it we enjoy the benefit of unity in one sole faith, one worship, one sole hierarchy. But it is permitted to extend the efficacy of these divine words and to see them inviting and guiding to unity all those who confess Christ. Has not the Lord Himself also said that there are other sheep outside His fold and that He will call them and that they will hear His voice and that there will be but one sole flock and one sole shepherd? (John 10,16) If Catholics regard as a duty the evangelization of non-Christian lands, how could they not be anxious to regain their brothers who, although they have left them, still continue to worship the same Lord Jesus Christ? Indeed what has been done to respond to the desire of Christ and of His Church cannot remain without results.

As well, how could one fail to see an invitation of Providence in this

nostalgia for lost unity which has troubled from the beginning of the century so large a number of our separated brothers? Whether one wishes it or not, there has been a change. The problem has been proposed. It has been recognized that divisions are not in conformity with the Gospel. Many of the motives invoked at the tragic hour of the cleavage have disappeared or are today without force. Furthermore the disadvantages of the rupture are clear to all, while every day one senses more intensely what force union would furnish in resisting the assaults of irreligion and in conquering for Christ these two-thirds of humanity which do not know Him. In this new atmosphere, the Catholic Church, contemplated with greater attention and sympathy, appears in the unquestionable grandeur which the firmness and continuity of its faith, the dignity of its priesthood, the vitality of is religious orders and congregations and the sanctity of many of its members bestow upon it. As Newman said of the Church of the Fourth Century: *Incussu patuit dea.* Many of the Amsterdam delegates have, in fact, manifested a sincere esteem of the Roman Church and a live desire for her collaboration.[2]

However the present reality which authorizes the greatest hope is the attachment that so many of the dissidents feel for Christ—the love, the adoration and the submission which they consecrate to Him. These sentiments are witnesses as much in private conversations as they are in public declarations and they move profoundly any Catholic heart. Herein the division appears more than ever deplorable and absurd. One begins to think that the love of Christ will do His work and that it will unite that which men have separated. Here again, at the heart of things, we meet M. Skydsgaard who writes that the more Christians "will search for truth according to Christ and live by it, the more we can hope that final unity will manifest itself *in spite of everything.*" It is impossible to give one's self to Jesus Christ without wanting to do His will; and this will is, as the Catholic Church reads it in the Gospel, that Christians be united under the staff of Peter. Will our separated brothers, enlightened by a sincere love of Christ, not finally come to perceive it?

And now, to conclude, there is something that the present situation does not seem to suggest either to our separated brothers or to ourselves, the sons of the Roman Catholic Church. My wish, as regards the non-Catholics, is that the Ecumenical Assembly should not stop with collaboration, as it will doubtless be tempted to do, but that it persevere and actually excite in all its members the desire of true unity with their confidence placed in Him Who wishes it for them. May the disciples of Luther and Calvin not fear to examine whether the divisions contrary to the will of Christ are not the necessary consequence of the very principles of Protestantism.

---

2) Not all, however. A French periodical has published a conference held out of session in which Karl Barth still speaks of the Pope as Luther did (cf *Reforme*, Oct. 16, 1948, *les justes protestations du Pere Denielou*). This same Karl Barth elsewhere spoke of the "apostasy" of the Catholic Church. Even in his address at the Assembly, he used words that were hardly irenic in regard to Rome. If this tone and this spirit were to prevail, it would be the end of ecumenism.

As for Catholics, it is greatly to be desired that they become aware of the anxiety which troubles the non-Catholics, and that they cooperate with all their might in the work of Providence. They are able to do much—first of all, without any doubt, by constant prayer; next by the example of a life which testifies to the sanctity of the Church, but by action also. May they support in every way the movements which further union; let those who are able explain by writings or conversations the divine claims of the Catholic Church. If union is sought from both sides of the barricade, although the search be made in different ways, the barricade will fall.*

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

---

*) This article reproduces a conference given by the author, December 5, 1948, at the Gregorian Institute at Rome in the presence of their Eminences Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Louis Cardinal Levitrano and Joseph Cardinal Pizzardo.

The Rumanians and the Drama of the Greek Catholic Church

Among the peoples who were drawn into the lamentable separation which was consummated in the eleventh century between the Church of Byzantium and the Catholic Church, the Rumanians have remained at heart and in their history, the closest to us. The existence of a strong *Greek Catholic Church*[1] had attenuated the breach there more than elsewhere, but, unfortunately, the most critical events which bear upon the question of *the Churches* and *the Church* are now taking place among them. When the Pope, for the month of January blessed the intention of prayer "for the constancy of the persecuted Catholics," he acted as the first head of our *united brothers* of Rumania. The Holy Father acted again as their first head when, in his *Christmas Message* he spoke of the heroic firmness of some, and the spiritual torments of others and declared, "We do not ignore the bitter path which many of our beloved sons and daughters must follow, whom a manifest system of violence has impelled to separate themselves formally (that is to say, exteriorly) from the Mother Church to which their deepest convictions united them."

In the sentiments and according to the very testimony of their non-Catholic compatriots, and we call to mind that European, Nicolas Iorga, the Rumanian Greek Catholic Church was a jewel of Rumania as it was a jewel of the Catholic Church, and she had played a unique rôle in the tormented history of her country.

In keeping with the spirit of the review UNITAS, we shall avoid separating in our thoughts those whom we call our separated brothers from our united brothers who now endure tribulation. Thus, we shall make a joint exposition of what the Rumanian Catholic Church meant to all that people, largely dissident, and what the recent history of that Church has been in the history of all that people.

Among a people which has known in its history only twenty years of true peace, 1920-1940, history has allotted perhaps the most bitter fate to the Province of Transylvania. However, it is this provincial and somewhat peasant Church of Transylvania which was the base and the point of departure of all the national renaissance of the Rumanians in the nineteenth century.

It is well known that the name of Rumania did not appear in the political geography of Europe until the last century, in the days of the Crimean war when the two Rumanian principalities of Walachia and Moldavia, on the far side of Hungary, saw that first Iron Curtain of the Ottoman Empire—which in the sixteenth century extended to Vienna and passed across Hungary—slowly rising.

In their swift and most astonishing affirmation of themselves as a Euro-

1) This term refers to that body of the Rumanian people who use the Byzantine rite in their own language and are united in the Catholic faith under the authority of the Pope of Rome.

pean and an Occidental people, there was the fruit of a century, of two centuries, rather, of Catholicism lived by a part of the Rumanian population of Transylvania, that province predominantly Rumanian which had remained politically Hungarian until 1918.

It is not to be supposed that the Rumanians of the two principalities of the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, then of the "Old Kingdom" up to 1918, lacked culture and glory, nor that they lacked trials.

The two Rumanian principalities were born in the fourteenth century on the borderlands of the Hungarian Transylvania, as the outpouring of an overflowing cradle. The proof of this is in the fact that hardly a century after the first texts which testify to their presence this province was filled with Rumanians.

At the end of the last century, Moldavia lying toward the east, toward the plains and steppes, was occupied by the Mongolians, and later by the Russians. Walachia, at the beginning of the nineteenth century lay in the south, between the southern Carpathians, or Transylvanian Alps, and the Danube, toward those Balkans where the Turks were on the point of taking a foothold. This birth of two oriental states on the flanks of occidental Hungary took place in an obscure historic background. It occurred at the period when, from 1301 on, at the extinction of the ancient Magyar dynasty of the Arpads, Hungary was governed by two Italo-French kings, the Angevins of Naples, descendants of the brother of St. Louis. Walachia was under Charles-Robert, who with his entire army was almost massacred in 1330, in an attempt to depose or subject the "Transalpine" duke. Moldavia, in the angle between Hungary and Poland, was under his son Louis I, called the Great. As King of Hungary and Poland he was the most powerful sovereign then reigning in Europe, but unfortunately, in spite of the appeals of the Pope and the insistence of the then Catholic Basileus of Constantinople, he did not rise to put himself at the head of Christian Europe at that moment when the Turks were crushing the Bulgarians and Serbs and were encircling Constantinople which they were to sieze a century later.

In the next century the most illustrious successor of the Angevin dynasty was Mathias Corvinus who owed his throne to the prowess of his father John Hunyadi, the hero and the rampart of Christianity. The Corvinus family were Walachians of Transylvania. Their case throws light on the drama of the Transylvanian Rumanians. Their glory had united the two peoples, but they had united a people of peasants who had seen all their elite denationalized by the passage to Catholicism. It was precisely this situation, this alternative of choosing between the Angevins and their native lords which was to terminate in the formula for the act of union of 1700.

The two Rumanian principalities, made up of Greco-Slav Byzantine Christians, also struggled heroically against the Turks. They were still battling against the Turks in 1500 under Stephen the Great, Vaivode of Mol-

davia, called *Athleta Christi* by Pope Sixtus V, and even in 1600 with Michael the Brave of Walachia, at a time when Hungary herself had already long been reduced to a Turkish province (1526).

It was this indomitable resistance which won the two Rumanian countries that exceptional situation of not being reduced to the state of province, to *pashalik*, but of remaining principalities—vassal principalities under the Turkish suzerainty which guaranteed their territorial integrity. In fact this guarantee was not violated until the Turks ceded Bucovina to Austria in 1775, and Bessarabia to Russia in 1812. Bolshevik Russia, as is known, took back Bessarabia with the north of Bucovina in 1945.

From the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, the Rumanian principalities surpassed Russia in aiding and furnishing refuge for all the old Christian peoples of the Orient, and these brought to the Rumanians and transplanted among them that culture of Byzantium which instigated the Renaissance among us. Before and with Peter the Great, Rumanian scholars and ecclesiastics contributed to the rise of Russia. Among these are Peter Moghila, the great Metropolitan of Kiev (1633-1646) who, in his resistance to Protestantism, established the Oriental doctrines upon formulas which were close to Catholicism; the Spatar Milescu who sought and found our Catholic missionaries in China, and who previously had secured the testimony of the Oriental Church in favor of the Catholic belief in the Eucharist against Calvinist negations in a work published in France by Arnauld and Nicole (*Perpétuité de la Foi touchant l'Eucharistie*, Paris 1669); Prince Cantemir, the unfortunate ally of Peter the Great, a scholar renowned in Europe, and already become a European like Iorga; and his son, Antioch Cantemir, outstanding among Russian poets.

The constant relations of the Rumanian princes with the Christian states caused them to lose the confidence of the Sultans. Certain heroic circumstances lend something of the character of martyrdom to the execution of Constantine Brâncoveanu with his family at Istanbul, August 15, 1714. He was the ancestor of Countess Anne de Noailles de Brancovan, the French poetess. From that time, the Turks themselves sent Greeks of Constantinople, Greeks of the Phanar, the Greek section of the Patriarchate, to govern the Rumanians. The Phanarite princes of that period ending in 1821 were obliged to pay for their perpetually interrupted reigns with gold. It was an epoch of inconceivable extortion and suffering for the people, on the one hand, and on the other, it was an era of great cultural flowering for a brilliant elite, which in part was foreign. From the beginning of the nineteenth century the principalities were one of the fields of battle for the national emancipation of the Greeks, the Serbs, and the Bulgarians. On their own account the Rumanian patriots, in 1821 and in 1848, had to fight against their Turkish suzerains and their Russian protectors, as well as against their Greek masters. The great politico-religious problem of the nineteenth century

for the Rumanians was the recuperation of the monastic goods of all the monasteries of the land which pertained to the service of the Greek monks and monasteries.

The intentions of the Phanarites appear to have been excellent. Just before the French Revolution, the Mercure de France exalted the reform projects of the Rumanian Hospodar. The Russians, "Protectors" of the principalities during the wars of the Revolution and of the Empire, and during the Restoration, also inaugurated, along with the Ortanic Rulings of General Kisseleff, their wonted interest in social progress among others, while their politics already tended to oppose the orientation of the Rumanians toward the Occident, a movement which had begun under the Greeks, and then became irresistible because of the United Church of Transylvania. We do not speak of the fate of Bessarabia, whose light had been kept suppressed from 1812 to 1918.

The peasants hardly gained more than an increasingly demanding precision of their duties from the various social reforms of that period, while the sudden appearance at the beginning of the nineteenth century of modern economy along the Danube, which the Russians had reopened to commerce, overthrew the ancient patriarchal economy, and precipitated a new crisis for the peasants which was interpreted by Karl Marx as the violation of the ancestral pact of *condominium* of the peasant and lord over the common lands.

Meanwhile, toward the end of the sixteenth century, the Iron Curtain withdrew 500 kilometers at the west of the principalities, and we witness the opening of a new window, and of a new formula of Rumanian relations with the Occident upon a religious plan.

When Austria, at the end of the sixteenth century, had driven the Turks from Hungary and Transylvania as well, she found a modest Rumanian Church in this latter province which, through the passage of the centuries, had only partly and with great difficulty escaped from the Calvinist propaganda which bore with it the character of denationalization from the masters of the principality.

Transylvania, on the borders of Hungary, had never been more than a rather independent duchy, similar to the ancient Brittany at the confines of France. Wherefore, during the Turkish interregnum, she also had maintained a semi-independence in the form of a vassal principality.

In his unequal warfare against the Turks, Michael the Brave of Walachia achieved a symbolical unity of the Rumanian population for the duration of a year. In this time he established a Rumanian bishopric at Alba Julia in Walachia, where a century earlier the Calvinists had suppressed the Latin Catholic See.

The Jesuit chaplains of the imperial troups gained the confidence of this church and succeeded in uniting it with Rome at Alba Julia in 1700. The

Union of Transylvania, like that of Galitsia, adopted the formulae and the atmosphere of comprehension of the Council of Florence where the Rumanians had been represented by the Metropolitan of Moldavia. (This act of union of 1700 was violently attacked at Bucharest in October, 1948, by the Patriarch Justinian and by the governmental press.) On the part of the sincerely Catholic Hapsburgs, the Union had in addition the political advantage of reinforcing the Catholic element in a province where the Hungarian opposition to the Empire or to Austria was based upon Calvinistic Protestantism. On the part of the Jesuits, who were mostly Hungarian, their intentions were evidently religious, as were those of the Serbian monks who thirty years later were to lead back a part of the flock to the dissident Church.

This union could appear to the Rumanians of Transylvania as tending to separate them from their brothers and benefactors of Walachia. At first it had the result of definitely halting the national and religious danger of Protestantism. They expected to gain from it especially the concession of civil and civic equality with the official "Nations" of the land which the Emperor had promised. However the vigorous opposition of the favored classes and nations was so vehement that the imperial promises could not be, and were not, upheld. The tomb of the heroic Bishop Micu Klein is still preserved at Rome. He died in exile after having fought in vain for the immediate re-establishment of his people.

In the midst of religious and political upheaval, and with the zealous campaigning of the Serbian monks, about half of the Rumanian peasant population of Transylvania returned to the separated Oriental Church. Finally Austria organized a hierarchy for it which, in the beginning was Serbian.

At the time that Austria re-established the Latin Bishopric of Alba Julia, the Rumanian Greek Catholic Bishopric was transferred to the small provincial town of Blaj. This happened in the time of Micu Klein who was the founder of it.[2]

It was, however, Blaj itself which succeeded in realizing, slowly and gradually, Bishop Micu Klein's program of upliftment and emancipation. This was accomplished in the beginning by its schools, and then, on a larger scale, through the effects of the bond and the contact which its priests had with Rome and with the Occident.

The professors and the historians of Blaj created the new national *Credo* of the Rumanians, making it to extend even beyond the Transylvanian fron-

---

2) The diocese of Blaj, later an archdiocese with four suffragan sees, continues to bear the title *Alba Iulia and Fagaras*. The latter is a small town of the south near Walachia where the Greek Catholic Bishopric existed for a few years and where Greek Catholics and dissidents disputed the possession of a fine church built by Brancoveanu. Alba Julia is a Latin name evidently adopted by the Rumanians; it was, however, merely a name from medieval Latin, being an accommodation of the Hungarian name Gyula Fehervar. The old Slavic name of Belgrad, "Ville Blanche," which the Rumanians gave it, is one of the rare clear traces of their traditions actually extending to a period prior to the Hungarians in the country.

tiers. They put their faith and pride in being a Latin people in that country before the coming of the Hungarians and since the Roman period.

They were Latin as were the Italians and the French. Their nation, their language, and their literature ought to be regenerated when brought into contact with their sister nations. The three Masters of Blaj were most notable among those who, from the end of the eighteenth century, showed that Rumanian could be written in the Latin orthography of the Italians or the French.[3]

It was the Transylvanians who created the modern schools of Walachia and of Moldavia. In 1917, at the fall of Russia which had held Bessarabia since 1812, it was the Transylvanians who persuaded the Council, the Soviet of the country, to give itself without reserve to Rumania.

When the Church of the great Rumania of 1918, an autocephalic church since the nineteenth century, gave the title of Patriarch to the Metropolitan of Bucharest in 1925, some laymen (Ghibu) and some Bishops such as the ex-Metropolitan of Bucovina, at the time a refugee in Italy, thought and wrote that the first Patriarch who should be advised was the Occidental Patriarch, the Pope of Rome.

As is evident the country was not, in so much, Catholic. The two first kings of the dynasty, whom they had requested of Napoleon III, were Catholics. They were of the elder Catholic branch of the Hohenzollerns, whom we might call "*napoléonides.*" However, their successors Carol II and then his son Michael I, were obliged to submit to the clauses of the constitution which determined that the heir to the throne would be of the "Orthodox" religion.

Signs of orientation toward the Catholic Occident multiplied especially during the months which preceded the war of 1940, such as the visit which the Minister of Propaganda, the historian Giurescu, made to Pius XII.

Between 1920 and 1940 Rumania had experienced an enormous cultural development. For instance, her great son, Nicolas Iorga, created present Byzantinology through the Byzantine Congresses. She continued her ancient traditions of hospitality toward Christians of the Mohammedan regions. In 1937 she welcomed at Bucarest, upon the advice of the same Iorga, the great Byzantine Institute of Constantinople of Kadi Köy of the Assumptionist Fathers, known for their unionist apostolate throughout the Balkans.

At this period—according to the charts of the *Maison du Livre* at Paris—Rumania was the first among all the nations in the reading of French books. Catholic France shared this audience to a very large measure. As for the young priests of the United Church, they went to Rome, Louvain and Strasbourg for their formation.

But again, this does not mean that Catholicism did not have difficulties

3) Especially, they borrowed the sound *j* in words such as *june*, young man; *judeca*, to judge, for a sound for which Hungarian and likewise Yiddish supplied only the zs, as in Cluj, Kolozs-var, the name of the modern capital of Transylvania.

in Rumania, especially in the sensitive regions of the "Minoritarians" in Transylvania, difficulties which had been increased, sometimes without scruple and without shame by certain neighbors. The polemics of the Press were not always kind between Blaj and Sibiu, the dissident ecclesiastical capital of Transylvania.

In public life, however, the Latin Catholic Church which had been reorganized with the Archbishopric at Bucarest, and the Greek Catholic Church, the second national Church, had their place of honor. The vote on the Concordat did not arouse any of those dramas which Serbia saw in 1938, and, in the Chamber, on questions such as the divorce law, the word of the Metropolitan of Blaj, for instance, awakened an echo which was not totally extinguished. One of the last presidents of the Academy before the war was a Greek Catholic—Bianu. The first, about 1848, was the great philologist of Blaj, the Greek Catholic Canon Ciperiu. The faithful of the Latin Church in general represented "Minoritarians" or foreigners, excepting in Moldavia with the See of Jassy, or Iasi, fruit of a secular Polish influence and Franciscan apostolate. In the society of the Old Kingdom, the Latin and the Greek Catholic Orientals hardly existed, save for certain remarkable exceptions: an old M. Coculescu, let us say, Coculesco, an astronomer who became Catholic at the time when difficulties arose against the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar—he was father of a French writer and poet who writes under the name Pius Servien; and a M. Theodor Carada of the high aristocracy of Bucarest whose uncle had been the "gray eminence" of the first king of Rumania—he became a Greek Catholic, so attached to the usages of the Oriental Church that the deceased Metropolitan of Blaj, Archbishop Nicolescu, of whom we have just spoken, had said of him that he wanted to lead them back "to an Orient of Mesopotamia." Concerning the attitude of the whole people and of the whole country toward Catholicism and toward the Greek Catholic Church of Blaj[4] we shall finish by describing the view of the two most representative men of the Rumanian soul: the historian of European fame, Nicolas Iorga, who died tragically in 1940, for the present period, and the national poet Michail Eminescu, who died in 1889, for the latter part of the last century.

First of all, the great poet of Rumania was a kind of de Musset, tinged with German pessimism, weeping for his unbelief, as he does in some splendid poems to Christ and to the Virgin. They overflow with popular Rumanian poesy, the most splendid of all latinic popular poesy.[5]

4) One could make a more thorough sounding by reading *Une enquete sur l'Union des Eglises en Roumanie*, French edition with introduction by the Rev. Fr. Th. Disdier, A. A. (Augustinian of the Assumption) and a letter-preface of H. E. Gabriel Hanotaux, of the Canon Georgescu of Oradea Mare. We have reviewed this translation of the Rev. Fr. Disdier in the *Orientalia Christiana Perodica*, V, Rome 1939, pp. 249-253. The attractive personality of Carada will be discovered there as well as an allusion of his to the rarely conclusive polemics, the "telegraphs" and the "telephones" between the press of Blaj and that of Sibiu. It seems that these polemics were finally calmed on the eve of the 40's.

5) Cf. our study: *La Vierge dans la litterature populaire roumaine*, a chapter of one of the two books of a Marian collection *Maria*, to be published by Beauchesne, Paris, 1949.

As a matter of fact, Eminescu remained an Oriental, separated, but a Christian. As a young man he left his native Moldavia to do his studies at Vienna. When passing through Transylvania he had greeted the little town of Blaj, "Little Rome," *Mica Roma* with a cry of filial love. Later, as a journalist, at the time of the campaigns of opinion against the Jesuits, he offered warm witness in favor of his educators whom he knew.

The case of Nicolas Iorga is more clean-cut, and his voice from beyond the tomb—he fell victim of the tragic events of 1940—will be the best response to the clamors which the executioners of the Greek Catholic Church in Rumania joined to their wicked task, claiming that the Union of Alba Julia in 1700 was a political and Jesuitical machination imposed by the oppressors of the Rumanian people. The oppressors—it is evident—do not exist any longer: the Greek Catholic Church has no more reason to exist.

Nicolas Iorga for more than a half century was the master, *dascal,* of all Rumania, while at the same time he was a historian of world-wide stature, a European. His erudition was universal. He had probed deeply in all domains (to the point that in a book by Marcel Cohen on Southern Ethiopia, one finds a chapter taken from Iorga). His works were not always clear, nor at all times suitable for direct use, but he was a master of thought for all the historians of Europe.

Like Eminescu, Iorga did not fail to make some attacks against Catholicism, Greek Catholic Rumanians included, but this was natural. His witness and his attitude doubtless take on all the more value for it.

We do not halt at the unhappy episode of Hajdu-Dorog, in 1912, when a part of the Greek Catholic Rumanians of Transylvania were for a moment attached to a denationalized Oriental Slavic diocese. The violent disturbance in Transylvania and at Bucarest was only calmed by the war. The cry "*Loss von Rome,*" leave Rome, was heard. The voice of Iorga was then raised in the tempest, and he pointed out that an accidental error doubtless did not justify such a radical measure in respect to a Church like the Church of Rome—that Church of the Popes of which he had been the great historian from the point of view of the history of the Crusades.

A gesture from the end of his life is more to the point and more curious. It occurred in a conference in January, 1940, a resumé of which was heard over the Vatican Radio a few days afterward. About the 13th of January, 1940, at an assembly of the Association of Orthodox Ladies, if my memory is correct, Nicolas Iorga held a conference on questions of teaching, and in fact, dealt with—it was his title—*the nature of Rumanian Orthodoxy.* The conference was held in the presence of the new Patriarch Nicodemus (Miron Christea had just died at Cannes).

In his paradoxical manner—I still see him saying to me: "*Românu îi glumetz,*" the Rumanian likes to joke—he began by apparently attacking our French nuns in Rumania, Dames de Sion, Religious of the Assumption, who

give, he said, Latin Catholic instruction to young ladies destined to live as mothers of families and ladies of the world in a dissident and Rumanian society. Iorga proceeded to say that they had no need for Latin Catholic formation. They had a Rumanian Catholic Church right at home—the Greek Catholic Rumanians were excellent Rumanians. Then this Iorga, master of the whole nation, exalted the precious value that this Church had for Rumania, which assured it direct contact with Occidental Christianity. He then recalled the character of separated Rumanian Christianity in the Orient, and how from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries all the monks and prelates of the Greek Church took refuge in Rumanian soil to carry on and to publish their polemics against the Latins. But, he pointed out, there was nothing in all this which represented the traditional faith of the Rumanian people. He concluded in the words of a historian, "The Patriarch of Constantinople cannot help being a Greek; the Pope of Rome is not an Italian." Then, before the Patriarch of Bucarest, he finished with these words: "Behold what I have had the courage to tell you!"

These words received the approbation of the separated Rumanians whom we had at Rome at the moment of that anguished beginning of a year—January, 1940.

At the present time there is a complete reversal. The country as a whole, like Poland, was expecting the arrival of the Allies. They fell under the absolutist dictatorship of their neighbor, Bolshevik, pan-Slavic, militant atheistic Russia. All the past was effaced in one stroke—until yesterday, Christmas, the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord. It spread once more throughout the country all its radiation of popular fervor, just as in our Occidental lands. Perhaps it brought with it some memory of the fact that they owe their Christianity—and their language—to the Fathers of the Latin Church, like that St. Nicetas of the Balkans, friend of St. Augustine, who was apparently the author of the *Te Deum*.

The writing of a few laws sufficed to make the Bishops subject to deposition, and to have the Catholics cut away from Rome, and to make it possible for the new Patriarch, Justinian, to be the choice of the government. In the days following the trip of the Patriarch Justinian to the jubilee celebrations of the Russian Church last July, the suppression of the Greek Catholic Church was decided and announced by him. It is said that one of the prelates who had most desired the "return" of the Greek Catholic Rumanians to the separated Oriental Church, the dissident Metropolitan of Transylvania, of Sibiu, is now not very proud of the means which were used to effect this.

With its million and a half of faithful, the Greek Catholic Church of Transylvania was, after the Ruthenian Church, the most important among those United Churches that extend and complete the Latin Church in the Orient.

At the present time, the five or six Greek Catholic Bishops who were

torn from their dioceses—after fruitless temptations—are all held in a house which is under close watch. The one exception is the eldest of them who is sequestered in a hospital where he is dying. The French and German or Austrian women religious—the "*Dames Anglaises*"—have been despoiled of their goods, then driven out or sequestered. The Rumanian nuns of Blaj fought with the police who expelled them.

The priests, of that Oriental peasant Church, who numbered about 1700, were the most vulnerable, living as they were in their villages with families to provide for. The tragedy commenced with them when the police began making visits to their homes. Then there was the comedy of a Synod convoked at Cluj in the beginning of October where about thirty priests, in the name of 400 Greek Catholic priests decreed the return to the dissident Church. We know how the signatures had been obtained—they had been acquired in such wise that some do not even remember how they had signed. Also, at Cluj entrance to the hall was forbidden to those priests who came to protest the injustice which was being committed in abusing the authority of their confreres' names.

Then these unfortunates were hastily led away to Bucarest, where they were seen arriving in their every-day clothes, just as they were when they had been summoned from their villages and fields, and where they had to be given cassocks for the ceremony of their reception at the hands of the Patriarch into the arms of their "Mother Church." They looked like galley slaves, according to an eye-witness who passed by Rome. One of them even became insane.

The other priests have disappeared. They celebrate the Liturgy during the night in private homes, or have lost themselves in the capital.

The newspapers of the emigrant Rumanians published by the national Church in the United States, *Solia* (The Herald) received the news of the reunion, or rather of the disunion of the Greek Catholic Rumanians with ironic and disgusted astonishment. At Paris, the committee for the Political Parties of Rumanian Refugees declared that the Greek Catholic Church will be re-established in its rights. The clergy of the separated Rumanian Church at Paris made a point of addressing their own protestation to the Pope when a few months ago the Concordat was unilaterally abolished by the government.

During this time of waiting for the hour of Providence, there is nothing left for us Christians of the Occident but to pray earnestly for all this people. Now they hope in none but God, that Power Who reigns high above states and political contingencies, for their deliverance.

FREDERIC TAILLIEZ, S.J.

The Repercussions of the Religious Breach Upon the Destinies of Europe*

It should not be a cause of astonishment if, in a fully rounded political era which takes for granted that both faith and the fact of religion have been annihilated, such a subject as the repercussion of religious schisms upon current world affairs should return once more as matter for serious consideration. It is a subject which our age at best ignores or pretends to know nothing of; more commonly it denies such influence. Notwithstanding, religious influence bears eminently upon contemporary politics, and precisely there where the political and economical strife between the peoples of the continent is most keenly actual while we envision, speak of, and work for the unity of Europe.

Public opinion everywhere has heard heads of government and statesmen, governments and parties, in parliaments and congresses, in the press, in the most decisive meetings and the most authoritative international assemblies speak of a *civilization of believers,* signifying a Christian civilization. They have affirmed that the rights of the human person, those of the people themselves and of the relations between nations should return to the inspiration of Christianity. Otherwise, they have concluded, the world will veer to ideas, morals and regimes which are contrary to the sense and the concept that man and civilized peoples have been formed by *civilization.*

The Atlantic Charter remains the most fundamental document for world reconstruction pursuant to the second crisis of the century. All have accepted it and have declared that they will adhere to it. It is invoked daily in the nascent understanding between the nations. The Atlantic Charter, we affirm, in its spirit and in its basic principles speaks of this return and of this essential Christian reawakening.

However, this topic, important of its very nature, and made urgent by the political and social progress of events, now takes on greater import, and its interest appears most timely because religious discussion *is turning acutely for the worse,* and in such wise that it offers once more the counter-proof of how greatly religious differences influence political differences, and a counter-proof of how much *religious union* would benefit, especially in this Europe of ours, an European union, and consequently, a general pacification.

The great book of time itself opens concordant and unequivocal pages on this theme:

The first political division in Roman Unity coincides with the religious division between Rome and Byzantium. Until then the axis of the civilized world had turned upon Europe, and a politically European Asia gravitated there. This was a religious division which had precise political motives and pretensions.

Caesar had transported to the Bosphorus, for reasons of supreme defense,

* Text of an address delivered at Bologna during the *Pro Unione* Week, September 11-19, 1948, by by Count Joseph dalla Torre, Director of the *Osservatore Romano.* This illuminating article enjoys the authority of his unique experience.

along with the imperial insignia and attributes, if no longer his participation in the divinity, at least that by which one day (a not too distant day in remembrance and in regrets) he called himself the *Pontifex Maximus*. At Rome, however, the Church had been born in persecution and had grown in liberty. The principle and the doctrine of the distinction of the two powers had been traced across the faith of Rome in one sculptural sweep of the Gospel and it shone brilliantly there in all its defining clarity, in religion as in politics: give to Caesar, give to God, that which is due to each. The *Pontifex Maximus* could only be from then on, and was not other than the one whom Christ had commissioned to build a spiritual bridge from earth to heaven, and who held his supreme Mandate to tend His flocks with no condominion of teaching or authority.

Only the clash of theological doctrines, the succession of heresies, the multiplication of ambitions, the shock of ideals and so often of worldly interests between faithful who were perturbed, erring, and divided, opened the way to a pretended disciplinary regimen and to an imperial ecclesiastical police of public order. This temporal police authority, in the *specious* solicitude of furthering clarifications and compromises, soon extended the office of pronouncing judgment upon the discussions of the contending factions not to the Pope (a religious sovereign, distant, armed with religious sanctions), but to the Emperor (a political sovereign, close at hand, capable of exercising material sanctions, if not more persuasive, certainly more secure under attack), capable above all of offering the secular arm to his theologizing friends.

Such is the genesis of the great schism which had as foundation that canon of Chalcedon of 461 (repudiated by Rome) by which the Church would no longer have rested upon the stable, immovable cornerstone which had been set by the very hand of Christ, but upon a portable authority carried about in the baggage of the civil power on its weary peregrinations.

Hence the contest of Constantinople for the primacy—as it was against Alexandria in the Orient itself, so was it against Rome in the Occident; hence the canonical justification for the fatal division of the hemispheric name. This ambitious strife, originating amidst the intertwining of multiple historical causes, was waged between a still strong, organic, unified Orient and a chaotic, divided Occident, which was exhausted by the barbaric invasions, but was soon to pull itself together and to rebuild itself, even though torn from the ancient political unity. The West was to renew itself and curb both the political expansion of Byzantium and the religious error which accompanied it to the detriment of the sole Faith and sole force of cohesion, *Roman Catholicism*.

Thus the new Frankish Caesar bore once again the name of Roman, when already the ancient one, the Byzantine Caesar, had lost it in both the religious and civil sense of the word. He prevented Europe from becoming

not only geographically the furthermost Atlantic peninsula of Asia, but, following the vulgar period, caused it to assume in the world the *primogeniture of Rome* with its characteristic civilizing mission.

Another religious break had to occur before this beneficent and venerable conquest should fall apart—three centuries before its heraldic insignia were to come to rest in the Museum of Nuremburg, when two empires, no longer Roman, no longer super-national, that of Austria and that of Germany, or better Prussia, had lived on for a sufficient span of time to demonstrate that Caesar without the title of Roman was nothing but a contradiction and an absurdity.

Protestantism in its incendiary expansion presents itself principally as a political phenomenon.

The relaxations of ecclesiastical customs, and the diffused aspirations toward a doctrinal and organic discipline which would be precise and complete were not in themselves reasons for the rebellion and separation of the peoples. All the "Propositions" of Wittenberg meant no more to the political world than the *Filioque* of Photius. When Leo X said that they were questions of monks, he spoke with more of Florentine sharpness than of disdain. He spoke the bald truth. If the fire spread instead of being extinguished, it was because the wind of politics was blowing full blast upon the religious issue. These politics were dynastic as well as economic which willed the exploitation of religious bonds for the purposes of the empire. Their will was to make of ecclesiastical goods a fresh source of prosperity in the impoverished states. They altered that which Rome had defined and condemned as *confiscation* of Church property in such wise that it could remain national church property, and with a Prince as head and administrator. Finally, there was the intention of confirming and enlarging political jurisdiction with the addition of that of the Church.

Let us reflect upon the constellation of the new Protestant states: There was Prussia through the apostasy of Albert Hohenzollern. He preferred becoming the head of his own dynasty to being Grand Master of the Teutonic Order. There was Sweden, where Vasa was tormented by the need of correcting bad finances. There were the Lowlands, ready to rise in rebellion against the Hapsburgs. Finally, there was England, where personal and political passions got the better of that very *Defensor Fidei* who had refuted Luther. Let us reflect upon these examples, typical European examples. They began with the cry *cuius regio ejus religio* (i.e., regional state religion, more precisely the religious profession of the dynasty), and finished in a religion which was an *instrumentum regni* (a means of independence and even of maintaining sovereignty). If we reflect well upon all this, we will be convinced that the religious motives or the excessive pretenses of the Roman Church, of the political predomination of the Hierarchy, or the revindication

of the liberty of the two powers, were ideal aspects of the crisis. The reality was Caesaropapism.

Thus history takes us by the hand and leads us to the threshold of modern times where it becomes a chronicler to guide us through the labyrinth of our own days. From the point of view of our purposes, they are found so designed that the religious line follows that political line which is commonly called the "Iron Curtain." It becomes identified with that sharp, foreboding scission which divides the two blocs. The complex interests which constitute them and set them against each other determine their astronomic names of Orient and Occident and they indicate a radical antithesis in the conception of individual and collective views in every aspect, be it philosophical, moral, social, political, or economical.

At this point, a clear understanding requires the recognition of the present political panorama according to its origin, its elements, and according to its reality.

The Orient and the Occident are set against each other, according to the most objective observations, because of a reciprocal fear of being overcome. Upon close study one finds that after a century and a half the world of revolutionary France is being renewed, and of France in relation to the world of the old order. Russia has also projected the work of radical internal renewal, proposes itself as an example, and makes of itself the center of incitation to universal reform. Insomuch it turns its face squarely against all international society.

Each side protests that it is on the defense—today in the political, diplomatic, economical field, as tomorrow it will in the sad hypothesis of a field of battle. We are not making an investigation here and do not intend to express opinions. This would be quite foreign to our qeust and would obstruct its ends. We wish merely to cite the fact that among the means of defense (namely, the rigor of internal discipline, frontiers fortified in such wise that along geographic boundaries, acknowledged with certainty as being beyond fear of enemy invasion, there exists a chain of allied and politically homogeneous allied countries; finally, activities among all the nations to bring about an immense covering of party friendships, besides the close net-work of alliances, capable of eliminating the overwhelming threat of hostilities) among the internal and external political precautionary measures, a singular sort of politics is being infiltrated into the Russia of today, and they are found most fruitful both outside and inside the boundaries. These are *religious politics,* however paradoxical the term might appear.

There have been, as we know, two phases of these politics.

When the Russian revolution burst and advanced in the name of the Communistic ideal, hence with all its preconceived anti-religious notions, the persecution surged against the national Church, with the intention of

destroying its spiritual power (extremely effective in swaying that profoundly religious people) and as an act of vengeance against its submission to the Czar, its effective head. The resistance of the hierarchy aggravated and renewed the violence. Soon, however, the priests of the so-called "Living Church," in imitation of the *prêtres jureurs* after the first blows of persecution in France, began to appear in Russia. The proud intransigence of the Patriarch Tykhon, and in the first period, of Sergius, was suppressed. Then came the war with its desperate need of uniting all forces, and of welding them together in spiritual solidarity. It induced, on the one hand, the patriotic adhesion of the Church to the State, while on the other, it achieved an armistice between the two conflicting powers—an understanding, a basis of cooperation which extended to State favor and protection. Militant atheism was forbidden. The army was provided with religious assistance. In the provinces menaced by the German invasion, and in those already occupied, an alarm was sounded in the name of the Christian faith, the marked prey of Nazism.

The gigantic conflict, the participation of Moscow in the Allied Powers, the political rôle which awaited it, bringing both the revolution and the revolutionaries to the green carpet of diplomatic conferences to ordain the fate of the world which they had determined to overturn, the zeal of the resurgent people, of that popular spirit for its state, and especially now for the *Holy Russia* which it considered to be and was in danger, all these elements combined to perpetuate the truce of Church and State. Thus Russia, whether the apostles of Communistic materialism, or whether the Bolshevik statesmen would or no, had revealed with the clarity of a page from Machiavelli what benefits might accrue from a religious peace, and could be derived from ecclesiastical influence. Even as it had been profitable yesterday in the politics of war, so would it be from now on in post-war politics.

Both peace and influence were solicited for two very singular motives: The National Church should consider itself in relation to the state, now rising to the power and the pan-Slavic aspirations of Peter the Great, in the position and in the ancient function which it enjoyed in Czarist Russia, or be condemned for serving the throne and tyranny and not the Fatherland and the people. In the second place, the Muscovite Church should reaffirm the mirage of union among all the Oriental Churches separated from Rome. This movement, by reason of the renewed political preponderance of Russia in the Orient, could quite well commence in Moscow and terminate, according to the natural development of events, in the transfer of the Patriarchate of the Orient from the banks of the Bosphorus (in case they should not be attained) to those of the Moskova. Indeed, such a transfer would be in perfect theological conformity with that canon of Chalcedon which states: *ubi Caesar ibi Ecclesia.*

We can, therefore, unhesitatingly and without fear of paradox call this policy the *ecclesiastical policy of the Soviet Union.*

Just as formerly, this ecclesiastical policy is being risked in our day among the perils of a divided continent. How and how much it returns to the same effects which division worked a thousand years ago—and precisely because of that same intertwining and uniting of ecclesiastical and civil interests—is made manifest by the double concomitant activities of the Supreme Soviet and the Holy Synod in their relations with the political system of the Oriental bloc as well as in their opposition to the Catholic Church.

At this point of our considerations, we may again depart from the consideration of ideals. According to the doctrinal principles of Communism in respect to Christianity, they could not have taken any other turn when confronted by the Catholic Faith. So much is this the case, that many learned observers prescind from them in evaluating political events. But objective history imposes itself upon all.

Such is the case in either of two hypotheses concerning Bolshevik politics, be it that one admits an essence, or at least a preponderance of revolutionary vocations or missions in the world, or be it that one supposes, rather, a rigorous nationalistic movement continuing and intensifying the directives and the programmes of the last three centuries of Russia, and for which the revolutionary motive is transferred into a proper means and instrument of action. Yet, perhaps we are—it is more likely that we are—faced with a new France of the Convention, or of the Directory, or of the Consulate and the Empire. In any case, the two eventualities do not exclude each other, but can exist together. At all events, it is quite obvious that in the first supposition of *révolution d'abord,* Communism and Catholicism form two opposing systems of principles, two doctrines, two opposing ways of life. If both are to be universalistic, then there is no plot of earth where both will not strive to plant its distinct banner, or where they will even be able to ignore one another. Hence, as regards the concept of revolution, a truce or understanding may be possible, or may be demonstrated as feasible, with national faiths and hierarchies which are arbiters of their own lot within their own national boundaries, but no such truce is possible with a spiritual power whose proper nation is the land of all the living, wherein it is burdened with the responsibility of millions of consciences of every race and of every land, and for all of whom it must render account to God, as it must to life and to the history of mankind down to the salvation of the last single soul.

Nor is it otherwise with the second hypothesis. "Progressive democracy" on one side, and nationalistic politics on the other are equally authoritative and statocentric. All is in the State, all is under the State, nothing is outside it nor above it. Religion is included, if religion must be. *The Church is included* if it would exist, and especially if it is advantageous to the state that it should subsist. If it is for the good of the state (the state is the judge and

exclusive administrator of the good of the state), it pertains likewise to the state to direct the cooperating elements. It was not for nothing that Hegel loaned to Marx the principles of the divine in the state—should ever some scruple of the faithful bring him to resist this spiritual as well as juridical subjection which amounts to a nationalization of souls.

When it comes to pass, then, that such a conception and economy of state meets in its path a Church which "suffers, strives and prays" in order to spread from "one sea to the other" its own tents, not only those of the altars, but also the tabernacles of the very civilization which she has bestowed upon the world, most evidently, that same policy which mitigated or effaced anti-religious conflict when religion served its purpose will stiffen against it when tolerance should be reckoned injurious.

A glance at the history of the controversies of Czar Nicolas with Gregory XVI concerning the Catholic subjects in the Ukraine and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw reveals that the purposes and methods of that which brought about the downfall of the throne but did not sever its policy are today fully renewed. These are the purposes and methods which serve now as then the interests of Russia. They persist; they have survived. Hence religion is considered the *instrumentum regni;* hence the principle of the religious creed is bound to the region, to the State, in a sort of spiritual enslavement to the earth, and no more and no less so than that construed by the Confessional States; hence that ostracism of a differing faith which might furnish a religious excuse to a subject before a civic duty; hence, the inexorable exclusion of any spiritual authority whatsoever extending beyond the pale of political power in order that it might thus enjoy a freedom of magisterium and an independence of judgment that place it above all international contrariety, and beyond the claims of any adversary.

A century ago the Catholic world witnessed sorrowfully the Czarist persecutions based on these premises, justified by no religious hatred, but by the cold interest of the state alone. Today, in like manner, we see Catholic subjects, that is, the Catholic Church, within the Soviet Union or its orbit, undergoing, once again, the same bitter trial for the same causes and with the same means.

Then also the separated Church, under the pressure of the caesaropapist State, consented to see in every Catholic at least a potential rebel. Today the Holy Synod does not act otherwise. Its censures of the Catholic Church are fashionably dressed in ethico-political aspersions, while its schismatic antagonism, ecumenical aspirations added thereto, continues to lend the *ecclesiastical arm* to the *secular power.* It differs widely in certain aspects, but in others it is identical.

The plan was delineated and began to unfold in the early part of 1945 when the Holy Synod prepared for the election of the successor of the Patriarch Sergius. It has already submitted to Marshal Stalin its plan of

reform in favor of a more efficacious central ecclesiastical government. The nomination of the Patriarch Alexis coincided with a resolution which imprinted a significant character upon the new undertakings and upon whoever should assume the direction from then on. It resounded against Rome, according to the text: "against those and in particular against the Vatican, who attempt with their intervention to save Fascist Germany, thus calling for mercy upon those who are responsible for the war and the misfortunes which afflict humanity."

All this occurred in the days following the Christmas speech of Pius XII. He had spoken of just punishment of each guilty party, but he had also called for equity in favor of peoples who had been misguided. *Pravda,* a Bolshevik governmental organ, had already given the signal of attack. Synodal sanction reinforced the attack, using the same concepts and almost the same words.

In the following May the Patriarch Alexis visited the Middle East. At Jerusalem he made a declaration of possession of all the Holy Places against Archimandrite Anthony, the English sequestrator of that property, whom he accuses of Occidentalism. In Egypt where there is a Soviet Legation, he found his visit prepared for and organized by Russian diplomats. Speaking to the prelates of the dissident Churches, he affirmed that the Muscovite Patriarchate was revindicating, if not the supremacy, "that position which befits it by the number of the faithful and by the power of the Soviet Republic." He augured and proposed the "liberation," as he called it, of the Patriarch of Constantinople from the Turks, well knowing the post-war hopes in this regard of all the faithful.

They were such that whoever should succeed in giving Hagia Sophia back to Christian worship would have achieved insuperable prestige, in fact, moral supremacy over all the schismatic Orient.

Furthermore, the Moscow Assembly of the Oriental Churches which gathered last summer to celebrate the fifth centenary of the Russian autocephalic Church was bent upon this intention. It was the root cause of the final objections, acts of resistance, and difficulties of tradition. The Primate of Constantinople's delegate expounded with the full weight of immemorable custom. But just as the Patriarch Alexis had led him to do so with that prudent deference which we have come to know, he likewise found, here and there, pretexts to obstruct the bearing of his discourse, and he artfully enlarged upon and re-shaped the delegate's words, until, little by little, he succeeded in augmenting the religious-political cause of Moscow.

Reserve had been manifested among the separated groups of the Slavic countries, and reserve had been evident among the National Churches. Thus, when in September, 1946, a call was issued for a Council at Moscow of all the different Patriarchates and by the Sees across the ocean, the Council failed to materialize. They objected that it was in the competence of the Phanar to provide for such matters.

It was then made known that the initiative was postponed because the person who was to present a report at the forthcoming Pan-Christian Assembly at Amsterdam had not yet completed it. However, the plan was not abandoned. It was realized only in July, 1948, according to the formula we have cited: a fraternal celebration of the Muscovite Jubilee. This occasion was designed, if nothing else, to persuade *de visu* that religious liberty now so prevailed in Russia that the dissidents from all the lands of Christian Orient could unite there peacefully and find both respect and safe shelter.

In reality, a step ahead was being made under the eyes of the whole dissident Church. For Czarist Russia it would have been a fool's hope. The latter had envisioned going to Constantinople. Soviet Russia welcomed Constantinople at Moscow in the person of its Patriarch.

If the present is linked with the past, this was no mere matter of chance. In the eyes of the Russians, the Patriarchate of Constantinople had always been the long arm of its political influence. The religious center of the Orient attracted Russia to the Bosphorus no less than did the possession of the Dardanelles. Herein lies the reason that the Phanar was obligated to St. Petersburg even for material aid. St. Petersburg consented to maintain the glory and prestige of the See of Primacy but all in drawing it within the orbit of that Russian power which was grasping for the glory and prestige of Byzantium. Already it bore the insignia of the eagle and the name of Caesar or Czar. Of like sort is the explanation for the counter-move of France to protect Catholics in the Orient with that same protection which Russia exercised over all the separated Orientals, and even over the sanctuaries of the Holy Land.

Truly, there is nothing new under the sun, though it glitter upon the crown of a Romanoff, or sparkle on the hammer and sickle of the Bolshevik Republics. If Russian tactics seem to have taken a novel turn, it is because of the precipitateness of modern events. The formation of the *Iron Curtain*, the welding of a homogeneous inter-state system—in which the Bosphorus was not included—along with either the fact or fame of primary and preponderant power—necessarily hastened a particular development in the aspirations and religious policy of the new Russia. It was no longer sufficient to act from far-off Constantinople among foreboding menaces and perils, from a confined See, and a confining one, enclosed by unfriendly neighbors.

For the present and for the future there was nothing else but the protecting shadow of the Kremlin. Within its walls an alert and robust political power was growing up which was second to none in the Orient, and which policed them all.

I think that the Patriarch of Constantinople, left, indeed, to continue occupying his See under the pale but invulnerable light of the crescent moon, had dire food for thought after the Moscow Convention. He must have found good reason to meditate upon his Nemesis. Those very causes for

which the first Oriental See had made itself a center of religious life *far from Rome and without Rome,* were lifting their heads again, but *far from Constantinople and without Constantinople.* The Assembly had been convened at Moscow to give homage at the Centenary Jubilee, but the recent declaration of the Patriarchate was by no means unknown among the members. It had no longer confined itself to that reserve which had been maintained three years earlier during the voyage for closer relations in the Orient. This declaration had attributed to the Patriarch of Moscow the Mandate of Christ to Peter—and not for the Russian Church alone, but for all the separated Churches, and indeed, *for the entire Christian flock!*

If this does not suffice, there is more. The ecclesiastical assembly of Moscow succeeded in agreeing upon two resolutions which exceed its apparent commemorative and congratulatory character. Most noteworthy was its decision not to participate in the Ecumenical Assembly of Christian Churches at Amsterdam. Its decision coincided with a vigorous attack of the *Cominform* press against this event, denouncing the Amsterdam Assembly as a religious alliance with the western reaction, precisely because—according to a fixed notion and irreducible bias of the Holy Synod—it must certainly be under the leadership of the Catholic Church. *Pravda,* on this occasion, had been allowed to pass the locked portals of that session of the Congress; at least it had been permitted to eavesdrop. It published, in fact, the ostracism decreed for the Amsterdam Assembly in that it was "*antidemocratic, warmongering and in league with the politics of the Vatican!*" And this while the Holy See not only was *not* invited as were the separated Churches, but would not, on the contrary, have accepted an invitation, as is by and large known.

Nothing now lacked but a final seal on the sentiments and the intentions of the Assembly against Rome. Hence, in a second conclusive resolution, it was declared that "*the Vatican is a center of international intrigues and of incitation to a new war against the interests of the people, and in particular of the Slavic people, against the weak and the exploited.*" Wherefore, the Patriarch Justinian, head of the National Rumanian Church, when he returned from the Congress, breathing at Bucarest the same political atmosphere as at Moscow, ventured to express the common opinion: "*The Holy See is no longer in the spirit or in the faith of Christianity.*" This was the sole anathema which did not contain political aspersions and which attempted to be merely religious. *For this reason it is the more serious,* since, throughout the great silence maintained in regard to progressive doctrines, the Russian Church implicitly admitted that these doctrines were in the spirit, if not altogether in the faith, of Christian revelation.

Thus the millenium of history which sprang from a lamentable religious breach, founded in turn upon a political breach no less fatal, arrives at a political breach which founds itself upon a religious one. The first exposed a

divided, weak and discordant Europe to the overflowing hordes of Islam. The second erects a difficulty, even morally, against that European unity which has been adjudged the decisive remedy for the fearful crisis of the Continent, of civilization and of peace.

Catholic aspirations and activities for the Unity of Christians do not solely deal and concur with the transcendental interests of truth, and that unity of His Church which Christ formed and confided to His followers. They do not campaign exclusively in speculative spheres which our modern world leaves unknown in this terrible hour (if indeed it is at all cognizant of them, it looks upon them with a distracted, indifferent eye). These speculative values are inherent in our most urgent social and political problems, for their initial cause and supreme conclusion always lie in the spiritual order. These Catholic aspirations and works embrace precisely that which, in this historic moment, most torments us. They are clamoring for and pointing out the cohesive forces which are the object of the world's anguished longing. Logically, we are recalled to the true nature of the Catholic Church. She recognized no insurmountable barrier to unifying charity between peoples when she called all nations to the aid of hunger-stricken Russia; the League of Nations applauded her then. This Catholic Church has always conceived of just civil relations in an indivisible harmony of spiritual principles with those of the social order—in a close, cooperative alliance between religion and moral, between moral and political custom. The Catholic Church cannot envision a resurrection of Europe unless within their geographic confines—which her missionaries of the faith and of common civilization had attained—all peoples from the Ocean to the Ural Mountains, fraternize, collaborate, strive for and conquer their mutual resurrection.

She is a true mother to this glorious Continent. She is that good Biblical mother standing before any judge who would cleave her child in twain. She denies and repudiates that senseless decree. Just as she deprecates the theory and practice of political or economical blocs between peoples of common labors, of the same historic civilization and progress, so is she unable to acknowledge any partial endeavor of unity whatsoever, or any ostracism prejudicial to anyone, even to one who through his own fault should not participate. She does, though, verily long for and betoken a recommencement full of hope, a beginning which promises an ultimate, universal assent, a pivotal point, a force of attraction for all which will banish cleavages so that tomorrow there will not be one Europe of Occidentals and one of Orientals, not one and the other Europe, but only one, transfigured according to Christ by its own citizens, the Europe of the Europeans.

Count Joseph dalla Torre,
Director of the *Osservatore Romano*

Resume of the 8th Lambeth Conference, 1948*

In July 1948, 329 bishops of the Anglican Communion out of the total episcopate of 430 met in London for some six weeks for the Eighth Lambeth Conference. Geographically they were grouped as follows:

The British Isles	133	West Indies	10
U. S. A.	68	Tropical Africa	16
India, Burma and Ceylon	10	China	11
Canada	22	Japan	3
Australia	22	Other Dioceses, including Korea, Egypt, Gibraltar, Jerusalem, Madagascar, and Singapore	14
South Africa	14		
New Zealand	6		

They had come to discuss common problems, to expose particular and local difficulties and, by taking counsel together, to lay down broad lines of policy for the guidance of the individual Churches and Provinces. Representatives of certain non-Anglican Churches had been invited to be present for consultation. Of the Oriental Churches, the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Churches of Greece, Poland and Yugoslavia had sent delegates. The Church of Scotland and the Free Churches of England were also represented.

The Conference followed its usual procedure. The bishops were divided into committees, each of which was entrusted with one of the large items on the agenda. The committees drew up Reports, and Resolutions based on those Reports were then discussed and agreed to by the whole Conference. Finally, an Encyclical Letter was issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of the Conference, summing up the spirit and results of the whole. All these three series of documents were published with an astounding rapidity and it is from the printed *Lambeth Conference 1948: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports* that the following notes are drawn.

The first 49 Resolutions are based on the Reports of two committees whose subjects were complementary and covered the Church in its relations to the individual and to the modern world. Man is an enigma unless he is seen against the background of God, his Creator, and the Incarnate Word, his Redeemer. There are various philosophies that would try to explain him without reference to religion, but they all break down. "Moreover, belief in man's eternal destiny must profoundly and radically influence Christian political and social thought. The value of man can never be exhausted in his social or political contribution; his worth is his value in God's sight." Man is a person and has rights independent of the State, and these the Church must strive to vindicate for him. "War as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of Our Lord Jesus Christ"; hence every endeavor should be made to limit armaments, control

*) This summary does not attempt to evaluate the doctrine contained in the Lambeth report, or to measure the various Protestant concepts of "Church" upon that which has been established by the Roman Catholic Church.

methods of warfare, support the United Nations. "The function of the State is to govern men so that they may live together peaceably for the good of all in this life. It will only exercise that function rightly and truly if it recognizes that every man is a child of God and that the Church has the task in the State of reminding men of an eternal destiny and preparing them for it." There can be different types of government, but under any government man's and the Church's basic rights should be preserved. The Church should support wise action of the State as far as she can. Communism is a name that covers a variety of meanings, not all of which are wholly bad. Hence, one may not condemn Communism, as such, outright. The atheistic Communism that originated with Karl Marx is bad and, rejecting and transcendent moral law, is often guilty of gross excesses.

The Church, however, will not overcome it by argument alone. "It has to be faithful to the Word of God and for Christians to live, and, if need be, die for the truth of God as He allows them to see it. But let us be sure that its martyrs die for the Kingdom of Christ and not for some lesser loyalty. By making common cause with anti-Communist forces, the Church might have some success but such a short-term policy would prove in the end to be disastrous to the Church, both in the east and in the west." For this, as for all else, the Christian has need of education—education in secular things, but in such a way that they lead him to God; education in his religion. Teachers should be regarded as delegates, not of the State, but of the parents; and where the State invades their and the Church's rights, the Church must resist. The Church "is a divinely created Society, the Spirit-filled Body of Christ through which He is still working in the world.

The first duty of the Church is to proclaim the universal sovereignty of God and His purpose for mankind, and to persuade men that apart from God life has no meaning or firm foundation. It is a fact, disturbing but undeniable, that modern man has largely lost the sense of God and of the supernatural world. His existence is explicitly denied by very many; for them there is nothing outside the material universe. By very many more God is no longer regarded as relevant to life; they do not deny His existence, but they confine Him to one corner of life." Worship is a recognition of the "worth" of God and, while "the whole of man's life may and should be its expression" there must needs be acts of worship, whereby man is helped to be at his best. Man's relationship to God underlies his relationship to his fellowmen. "There is no bond which is sufficiently all-embracing to make real the brotherhood of man except the Fatherhood of God." The Church must cultivate the fellowship of its members among themselves. "A healthy society can exist only on the foundation of a sound family life" and so every endeavor should be made to foster Christian conditions in the home. Now, much of what used to be accomplished by the home is done by public institutions and the Christian should take his part in them to influence public

life for good. In particular, education—with equal educational facilities for all—should be imbued with Christianity and the young man should carry his ideals into his work regarded not as drudgery but as a vocation. "To make the Church a living fellowship to-day, a company of friends, a group at prayer, a family whose life is the Blood of Christ and their spiritual food His Body, this is our calling. To send out into the world the young and old to serve their day and generation, instructed to bear witness to their faith in word and life, to find in city, town, and village their opportunities of service, in their vocation and in their leisure, for the sake of their fellows and to the glory of God, this is our crowning task."

The committee dealing with 'The Unity of the Church' divided into three sub-committees to discuss (1) The Church of South India, (2) Non-Episcopal Churches, and (3) Episcopal Churches and the Ecumenical Movement, but combined their conclusions in a common Report.

(1) The Report opens with a review of the history of the South India Church Scheme, the reception accorded to it by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 and the recommendations made by the Committee of Theologians in 1946. Since then the new Church has been inaugurated and so the relations between it and the Anglican Communion, arising from the new situation need to be regulated.

"The members of the Church of South India fall into three categories:

1. there are ex-Anglicans, whether bishops, priests, deacons, or laity;

2. there are other members of the Church of South India whose antecedents were not Anglican, and who have not been episcopally confirmed or episcopally ordained to the ministry, and

3. there are those who have been consecrated to the episcopate, ordained to the presbyterate or to the diaconate, or as lay persons episcopally confirmed, at or since the union.

"As regards these three categories we make the following suggestions:

1. Ex-Anglicans . . . should be accepted and should be allowed full privileges of ministry and communion . . . subject to the regulations of the responsible authorities in the area concerned. . . .

2. Those belonging to the secondary category . . . would be admissible to Holy Communion or to other Church privileges in any Church, Province, or Diocese of the Anglican Communion in which their admission would be in accordance with the regulations of the Church, Province, or Diocese concerned, though they would not have acquired any new rights or status in relation to the Anglican Communion as a whole solely by reason of their membership in the Church of South India.

3. It is in relation to the third category, those consecrated and ordained within the Church of South India, that certain difficulties arise. . . .

"It is not difficult to declare that the Orders and ministry of the Church

of South India are regular and valid so far as regularity and validity can be guaranteed by the 'form and matter' used in consecrating and ordaining. The Church of South India has been most careful to maintain the episcopal succession by the participation of three Anglican Bishops in its first consecration. . . . It has used for the consecration of its bishops a form, and has prepared an ordinal, so similar in all essentials to those in use in the Anglican Communion that any suggestion that these forms were in themselves inadequate to convey the authority of the episcopate and the priesthood can be dismissed without question. But it remains true that form and matter alone are not sufficient to guarantee the character of the ministry. That can be substantiated only by the faith and practice of the Church itself.

"Most of us . . . feel bound here and now to accept the Church of South India as a living part of the one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ" and to recognize its orders as true orders of that Church. "Others . . . hold that it is not at present possible to make any definitive judgment on the Church of South India and its ministry. The Church of South India is very young. . . . They are of the opinion that time must be allowed for that Church to grow into further unity and to manifest its stability and validity as a living part of the body of Christ." All, however, look forward "hopefully and with longing to the day when there shall be full communion between the Church of South India and the Churches of our Communion."

(2) Section II of the Report deals with non-Episcopal Churches. Under a heading: 'Theological Principles,' the Report observes that episcopal ordination is a necessary condition for the exercise of the ministry in any of the Churches of the Anglican Communion. "But this unity in practice has not ruled out a certain diversity of interpretation. Some, holding episcopacy to be of the *esse* of the Church, are bound by their convictions to hold that non-episcopal ministries are not ministries of the Church, and lack that authoritative commission without which there can be no guaranteed priestly ministrations. Others, while holding firmly that episcopacy is the normal method for the transmission of ministerial authority, yet feel themselves bound, in view of the manifest blessing of God on non-episcopal ministries, to recognize those ministries as true ministries and their sacraments as true sacraments. Yet others hold shades of opinion intermediate between those views." Whatever, however, the view held, for union or intercommunion with Anglicans, acceptance of episcopacy is necessary, "but room must be left for varying interpretations of the fact of episcopacy."

"The co-existence of the divergent views within the Anglican Communion sets up certain tensions . . ., but we acknowledge them to be part of the will of God for us, since we believe that it is only through a comprehensiveness which makes it possible to hold together in the Anglican Communion understandings of truth which are held in separation in other Churches, that the Anglican Communion is able to reach out in different

directions, and so to fulfill its special vocation as one of God's instruments for the restoration of the visible unity of His Church."

At the moment there are various schemes for reunion being worked out, which can, for convenience, be divided into two main types:

A. *Schemes for Organic or Corporate Reunion,* which would result in the creation of distinct, self-governing Churches separate from all the Churches from which they are drawn. Such is the Church of South India: such are those foreshadowed in the schemes for North India, Ceylon, Nigeria and Iran. Provided that the new Church "should be such as could be in full communion with all its parent Churches," this type of union has (so judges the Report) many advantages, though there is always the danger that it may involve damage to unities already in being, and the growth of small Churches incapable of a separate existence.

B. *Schemes for Cooperation or Intercommunion,* through the reception by some or all of the ministers of the Churches entering into the scheme, of the Orders, at the presbyteral level, of each other's Churches, with a view to making possible 'the provision in each Communion of a ministry acceptable to the other.' Such are the proposals put forward in Canada, Australia and the U. S. A. In his Cambridge sermon of November, 1946, the Archbishop of Canterbury suggested something on these lines between the Anglican and the non-episcopal Churches in England, but with this addition that:

"It contemplated the possibility of achieving intercommunion between Anglican and non-Episcopal Churches, which are sufficiently agreed in the realm of faith, through the acceptance by the non-Episcopal Church of the historic episcopate with the functions which have traditionally belonged to it." The immediate advantages of this type of scheme are that the difficulties involved in corporate reunion are postponed and that the Churches retain their identity without loss of part of their faithful, while at the same time certain local needs can be better met. There is, too, the possibility that, with time, corporate reunion might result. The Committee, however, felt that schemes of this second type are "in one important aspect only partially in line with suggestions outlined in the *Appeal to all Christian People* of Lambeth 1920," which "expressed willingness to consider some method for the mutual receiving of a commission, recognition, or ordination" only under the condition: "Terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted." These schemes ignore 'terms of union' altogether. In addition (the Report continues), they are not likely to lead to organic union nor, probably, will the partial intercommunion they offer attract the non-episcopal Churches. "We are not satisfied that what has been described as 'Episcopacy *in vacuo*' would really give to the non-episcopal Churches that which we or they would desire."

"In spite of these disadvantages we are not prepared to discourage further explorations along this line of approach, if there are linked with it

provisions for the growing together of the Churches concerned and likewise the definite acceptance of organic union as the final goal."

Then, after reviewing in some detail the various schemes of reunion still in process of being worked out and after recalling the relations with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U. S. A. and the Philippine Independent Church which, having seceded from the Catholic Church in 1902 and for some years having been without validly consecrated bishops, in 1946 appealed successfully to the Protestant Episcopal Church "that it might receive the orders" of that Church, the Report oulines 'Some Principles to guide further Progress.' These are mainly concerned with the ministry, that the theological issues involved should be squarely faced at the outset and that "The unifiication of the ministry in a form satisfactory to all the bodies concerned, at the inauguration of the union or as soon as possible thereafter, is likely to be a prerequisite" for a successful issue to the undertaking. "The ministry is, in our view, an organ of Christ in His Body and can only function healthily in the Body. None of us holds that tactual succession and correct formulae of ordination can guarantee a true and effectual episcopate or presbyterate apart from the faith and corporate life in which they are set."

(3) *Relations with Episcopal Churches and the Ecumenical Movement* is the theme of section 3. The Report first reviews the relations between the Anglican Communion and the other episcopal Churches. It notes the Catholic attitude clearly stated in the Encyclical Letter *Mortalium Animos*. "In spite, however, of the unyielding attitude of the Roman Catholic Church with regard to reunion and matters of faith, there have been signs in recent years of a greater willingness to take common action with other Christians in the international and social field." The Pope, too, has on occasions invited the co-operation of other Christian bodies against anti-Christian tendencies. "We believe that there is a considerable willingness on the part of the Anglican Communion to enter into a fruitful co-operation with Roman Catholics on a common ground. But we are frankly puzzled by the apparent contradiction between these repeated general invitations to co-operation which the Pope himself has issued and the attitude of many Roman Catholics in particular countries when it comes to definite programmes. . . . We are conscious of the urgent need of co-operation between Roman Catholics and other Christians on a common ground where ultimate questions of Church order and doctrine which divide us are not raised. We believe that the area, outside the field of faith and order, is very large. We would therefore greatly value further elucidation from the Roman Catholic side on the manner of such co-operation, and would be thankful if the way could be found to make it fully effective. We feel that no effort will be wanting on the side of members of the Anglican Communion."

With the Eastern Orthodox Churches relations have been very cordial and have resulted in various agreements, while with the Old Catholics inter-

communion was achieved in 1931. Discussions have, at different times, been held with the Scandinavian and Baltic Churches, but political events precluded any conclusions being reached with some of these.

So wide are the contacts with other episcopal Churches that the Committee could conclude: "In the course of our discussions evidence has been offered from various quarters that the ideal of the Church for which Anglicanism stands appeals to a much wider circle than those belonging to the Anglican Communion. . . . We believe that intercommunion by itself is not enough for a continued living connection. We wish to see the common relationship expressed in counsel and conference and mutual aid . . . so we would wish that bishops of the Anglican Communion and bishops of other episcopal Churches should meet in . . . conference for discussion on matters of common interest at regular intervals. . . . At first the number would be few. But the time may come when other episcopal Churches—the Eastern Orthodox, the Lesser Eastern Churches, and Churches formed perhaps on lines resembling the Church of South India, will send their delegates too."

The fourth main subject was 'The Anglican Communion.' It is a fellowship of independent Churches. These Churches "are Catholic but reformed; they are reformed but Catholic. The embodiment of this character is the *Book of Common Prayer.* It is not only an important source of Anglican teaching, it is also the means by which the Anglican tradition has been sustained. The English Reformers were not trying to make a new Church. It continued to be the Church of England, the *Ecclesia Anglicana,* as the Magna Carta described it in 1215. For this reason the Anglican Communion is not a sect. It is a true part of the Church Catholic.

"The Church of England was, and the Anglican Communion today is, organized on a territorial principle. . . . The free growth and expansion of this Church has been given different emphases according to the countries in which it has been planted. . . ."

"The question is asked, 'Is Anglicanism based on a sufficiently coherent form of authority to form the nucleus of a world-wide fellowship of Churches or does its comprehensiveness conceal internal divisions which may cause its disruption?' " Authority within the Anglican Communion "is distributed among Scripture, Tradition, Creeds, the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the Witness of saints, and the consensus fidelium, which is the continuing experience of the Holy Spirit through His faithful people in the Church. . . . This essentially Anglican authority is reflected in our adherence to episcopacy as the source and centre of our order, and the Book of Common Prayer as the standard of our worship. . . ."

The Anglican Communion is now world-wide and must cultivate international understanding and good will among men. Its growth can be illustrated by these figures: in 1800 it had only 75 dioceses; in 1939, 320; the first Lambeth Conference was attended by 75 bishops; that of 1930 by 308.

To foster collaboration between the widely separated parts of the Communion, it is suggested that an Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy be formed; and to ensure an adequate supply of fit ministers to carry on the work, "it is highly desirable that standards of training throughout the Anglican Communion should approximate to each other as nearly as possible. To help achieve this, it was proposed that a Central College should be opened in Canterbury, and to aid cohesion of the Church a Pan-Anglican Congress was recommended to take place in 1953.

The last sections of the Report deal with 'The Church's Discipline on Marriage' and with 'Baptism and Confirmation.' In England—and the same is true of many other countries—"public opinion in favour of permanence in marriage has gravely declined, and divorce is ceasing to carry a public stigma." Yet, "there is evidence that public opinion is shocked by the growing number of divorces" and the Church must support to the utmost the Christian view.

"In view of the prevailing confusion of thought about marriage, a statement on fundamental principles is necessary:

(I) Marriage is a holy estate, instituted by God and so existing in the natural order, involving the union for life of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others.

(II) The purpose of marriage is the establishment of a home and family life, including the procreation and upbringing of children. . . .

(III) A marriage is created by the free, competent and open consent of the parties who contract it. This contract is not terminable by either party: it establishes a permanent relationship.

(IV) Marriage entered upon by Christians is endowed with the gift of special grace to the man and the woman for the fulfullment of its obligations and the realization of its ideals. . . ."

The Committee recognized within itself divergence of view on the indissolubility of marriage, some holding that it can never be dissolved; others that sin can destroy what should, in God's intention, be permanent. "We do not make any attempt to reconcile these two conflicting views. While recognising a difference of theological opinion, we are yet agreed on the matter of marriage discipline." In respect of this, the Church has a duty to uphold 'our Lord's principle and standard of marriage' as 'a life-long and indissoluble union,' and at the same time 'of shepherding those who have failed to live up to this standard.' Therefore, "the marriage of one whose former partner is still living should not be celebrated according to the rites of the Church." but a form of prayer after a civil marriage of such, if privately performed and with the approval of the bishop, should not be forbidden. The concession made by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 that the innocent party in a divorce might, with the bishop's permission, be given Holy Communion, can hardly be denied to the guilty party also, if repentant,

but the Church's principle should be that marriage after divorce means the forfeiture of the right to admission to Holy Communion and exceptions to this principle should be granted only by a bishop after careful enquiry into the circumstances.

The policy of universal civil marriage to be followed by marriage in church for those who wish it is undesirable. Mixed marriages of Christians and non-Christians are a problem chiefly in the mission-field and should be forbidden, though each Province must work out the details of its own discipline. Marriages between an Anglican and a member of another Communion are strongly to be deprecated and "we assert that in no circumstances should an Anglican give any undertaking, as a condition of marriage, that the children should be brought up in the practice of another Communion."

The section on Baptism and Confirmation gives a brief review of the history and theology of the rites of initiation and then passes on to the consideration of practical problems. The Committee does not recommend any change in the customary practice of infant Baptism and of the conferring of Confirmation in adolescence. Much, however, could and should be done in instructing god-parents in their obligations and by ministers maintaining touch with children in their early years. Confirmation should be preceded by a careful preparation of the candidate and could be made the occasion when the young Christian, baptized before he could consciously profess Christianity, might publicly and personally make his profession of faith.

J. Gill, S.J.

Will Union Be Easy for the Orientals?

Does there exist in the dogmatic order a real obstacle to the accession of the Greco-Russians to the Church of Rome?

At this moment when, through falsehood and violence an attempt is being made to lead millions of Catholics of the Byzantine rite away from the fold of Peter, the question stated in the above title should not lack interest. We shall first explain the title.

By the name Greco-Russian we understand the faithful of the autocephalic churches of the Byzantine rite, of which the totality constitutes what is commonly called *the Eastern Orthodox Church,* or the *Greco-Russian Church.* It is not one sole church, but several churches independent one of another, administering themselves in an autonomous fashion in large measure, and in general undergoing the interference of the state in which they are located. Each one is divided into a certain number of dioceses having bishops at their head in the Catholic manner. The central power is habitually constituted by one or more synods of variable composition. The personal government of one sole prelate is excluded. All decisions are collegiate.

That which radically distinguishes these churches from the Roman Catholic system is the absence of all *common and permanent* supreme authority. They acknowledge, nevertheless, a *transitory* common supreme authority, namely, the Ecumenical Council. In fact, the authority of this council is purely theoretical for them because, according to the avowal of their theologians, no assembly of this kind has been held since the Seventh Ecumenical Council, the second of Nicea, in 787, and cannot be held as long as the schism with Rome lasts. That which permits these churches to reunite in a common nomenclature is first, a bond of spiritual brotherhood which is realized through the unity of ecclesiastical communion. It is a bond which ought to exist in principle, but which, in practice, is frequently broken, as is witnessed in our own times. Certain sister churches anathematize each other but the resultant cleavage does not affect the others. Next, it is a certain unity of faith, as long as it reduced to the minimum of the express definitions of the seven first Ecumenical Councils. Finally, it is the unity of liturgy or rite: all these churches follow, indeed, the Byzantine rite. Among them, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, called the Ecumenical Patriarchate, has for a long time exercised a real primacy of jurisdiction which has been altered, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, to a simple primacy of honor and precedence. This patriarchate is, at the present time, one of the smallest autocephalous units according to the number of its faithful. It still maintains, nevertheless, a certain prestige, and enjoys, at times, a rôle analogous to that of the Pope in the Catholic Church.

Taken in its totality, the Greco-Russian Church is that one of the Christian confessions which most approaches Catholicism. In it, in differing degrees, one finds almost all the Catholic elements. It lacks hardly anything

excepting the Pope and that which this lack supposes. Between it and the Catholic Church, union would be very easy to realize. The great barrier is that of age-old prejudices created by the antipathy between Greeks and Latins, and above all by political events. In our times, what one calls the Byzantine Schism has no longer any *raison d'être*. The ancient pretexts for separation have disappeared. These pretexts were of three kinds: there were divergences in doctrinal order, differences in liturgical order, and differences in canonical or disciplinary order. Of these three categories, only the doctrinal divergences merit consideration in our times. The others have practically received their solution from the day that Catholic churches of Byzantine rite maintaining the ceremonies, customs and usages proper to that rite began to function. The latterday polemicists are free to examine for us once again the question of the azymes, the Saturday fast, or the use of milk products and eggs of the first week of Lent. These matters do not concern serious minds any longer, especially the Christian worthy of the name who is mindful that the great precept of the Lord is fraternal charity and the desire of His Heart, the realization of union among those who believe in Him and love Him truly.

Union, however, ought to be accomplished in the truth. Divergences in the dogmatic order must be made to disappear; wherefore the question which we propose to examine in the following pages: *Between the Catholic Church and the present Greco-Russian Church, does a true dogmatic barrier exist, that is, do one or more doctrines considered from both sides as revealed truths, true dogmas imposing themselves with obligation upon the faith of the believer, oppose each other contradictorily?* We answer the question stated in this manner: *This dogmatic barrier exists from the Catholic side; it is nonexistent from the side of the Greco-Russian dissidents.*

It exists from the Catholic side because some of the questions which had been argued between Greeks and Latins during the modern period and up to our times have been definitively resolved by the infallible magisterium of the Catholic Church. The solutions given by this magisterium constitute real dogmas which oblige acceptance on the part of all the faithful of the Catholic Church and which she cannot alter and which she never will alter. Such, for instance, are the dogmas of the primacy of jurisdiction by Divine Right and the personal Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter; the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son, or from the Father through the Son, as from one sole principle; the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; the existence of a temporary and intermediary state between Heaven and Hell after death which we call Purgatory; the immediate retribution made to the souls of the deceased after death, whether it be of recompense or chastisement. No more discussion is possible among us on any of these points. They are determined for all time and whoever wishes to belong to the fold of the successor of Peter must accept them.

They do constitute a barrier and the dissident who will not wish to admit the dogmas must come to a halt against it.

There is nothing of this sort, on the contrary from the side of the Greco-Russian Church. That Church possesses no fixed and definitive teaching on any of the doctrinal questions which have been controverted in the past or which are being controverted today with the Catholics. The faithful of that church can hold the *pro* or the *con* on each one of them. They may choose, if they please, the Catholic thesis without those of contrary sentiments being able, legitimately and logically, to treat them as heretics or as heterodox.

Our assertion may at first sight appear surprising, and the history of relations between the Catholic Church and the dissident Orientals seems to contradict it. Did not, indeed, the numerous attempts at reunion which occurred between the end of the eleventh century and the middle of the fifteenth century come to a halt precisely before the obstacle of the dogmatic question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son? And in our times, is not the great obstacle to reunion the Catholic dogma of the Primacy and the Infallibility of the Pope? If the dissidents did not have fixed and unalterable doctrine on these questions, could schism continue to exist? To this objection we respond: It is unfortunately true that schism still exists, but it is also true that from the side of the dissidents and from their point of view, there does not exist any unalterable teaching of a dogmatic character on the controverted points which are opposed to the Catholic theses. We can offer two proofs equally conclusive concerning the correctness of this affirmation: *one proof de jure, and one proof de facto.* We shall begin with the proof de jure.

The Proof de Jure

It is commonly said among Catholics that the autocephalic churches of Byzantine rite, of which the totality constitutes what we call the Greco-Russian Churches, do not possess among themselves unity of faith, and the classical proof is given: that the Greeks rebaptize Catholics, while the Russians receive them by a simple ceremony of abjuration and a profession of faith. Is the proof apodictic? If it to be so, the question of the validity of baptism of the heterodox would have to have been definitively resolved for the Greco-Russian theology as it has been for Catholic theology by the Council of Trent. Another example: Certain Russian theologians of our times place in doubt the existence of the seven-fold number of sacraments while the immense majority of their co-religionists have admitted this doctrine since the fourteenth century. Does it follow that these few theologians can be treated as heretics in the name of the theological principles admitted by the autocephalic Churches? By no means because the first principle of the Greco-Russian theology of the present time is this: *Only the express definitions of the ecumenical councils constitute the obligatory object of faith, the dogmatic element, properly so-called, that all the faithful must accept. The infallible*

magisterium of the Church has only one organ for expressing itself: it is the ecumenical council. As long as it has not pronounced on a question, it remains matter of free discussion. But, what is the number of the ecumenical councils recognized by the autocephalic churches of Byzantine rite? Exactly seven, the first seven. This is why they sometimes give themselves the title of *The Church of the Seven Councils.* The last of these Councils was held at Nicea in 787. Since this date, to be precise, for 1162 years, the infallible voice of the Church has not made itself heard for the faithful of the Greco-Russian dissidents. A minimum can be found then upon which, *at least in our times, unity* of faith is realized for the totality of the autocephalic Churches. This dogmatic minimum[1] is constituted by the explicit and direct definitions of the seven first Ecumenical Councils. Herein lies the central nucleus of common orthodoxy, a truly orthodox nucleus for the various Churches since the Catholic Church also accepts the definitions of these same councils.

If one reduced the orthodoxy of the Greco-Russian Churches to this minimum, this orthodoxy is truly orthodoxy; but from the point of view of Catholic orthodoxy, it is an incomplete orthodoxy, an orthodoxy which is retarded by 1162 years. It lacks all the definitions which have been formed among us since 787. Divergences have arisen and controversies between the two Churches have burst forth over these new questions which have been officially defined by the Catholic Church since the consummation of the schism. But it is apparent that their importance is greatly diminished by the fact that from the side of the dissidents the opposition against defined Catholic dogmas has only the character of individual theological opinions and not of dogmatic theses properly so-called. Passing in review the questions controverted from Photius to the present time, it is evident that none exist which have been explicitly and directly concluded by one of the seven first Ecumenical Councils. *For the Greco-Russians, they are, consequently, free questions, upon which diversity of opinion is permitted.* Those among them who please to choose the Catholic theses cannot logically be dealt with as heterodox and as heretics by their co-religionists of the contrary opinion. (Thus the Russians can recognize the validity of the baptism of heretics, and the Greeks deny it, and still remain orthodox from their own point of view, because none of the seven Ecumenical Councils has settled this question in a way that is really clear. The number seven of the Sacraments is in the same situation. The definitions of the ancient Councils are silent on this point and the Russian theologians of our days who deny the title of sacrament to marriage and

---

1) It is to be noted that this *minimum* orthodoxy is at times maintained only with difficulty in these Churches. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, between 1760 and 1840, the Russian Church in its totality and according to its theological manuals professed the principal theses of Protestant theology, including the *fallibility* of the Ecumenical Councils. Recently a renowned Russian theologian, Sergius Bulgakov (+1944) has been known to deny the eternity of the punishment of Hell in spite of the definition of the fifth Ecumenical Council against Origenism, and to restore Apollinarism more or less openly. It is true that he was condemned as a heretic on two occasions, in 1924 and 1927, by the local synod of Karlovtsi, but at the same time others made a declaration of orthodoxy in his favor.

grant it to the monastic habit, or to the funeral rite, cannot be accused legitimately of heterodoxy by their equals.)

It then rests well established that since the Second Council of Nicea (787), the Greco-Russian Church has made no new dogmatic acquisition and that the theologians can freely dispute on all the points which have not been explicitly defined by the seven first Ecumenical Councils. Doubtless a certain number of dissident theologians do not wish to accept this conclusion. Beyond the solemn and extraordinary magisterium of the Church, they admit according to the Catholic example, the ordinary magisterium which is no less infallible than the solemn magisterium, and they think that this ordinary magisterium was exercised in the seventeenth century by the unanimous approbation of the two confessions of faith which were then formulated; namely, the Catechism of Peter Moghila, called the *Orthodox Confession of the Oriental Orthodox Church,* and the *Confession of Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem.* These two documents would be clothed with infallibility and would have the same value as the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils. But (besides the fact that unanimous approbation is historically false), the theologians who are of this opinion become increasingly rare. (The majority of contemporary theologians deny ecumenical authority to these Confessions, declaring them marred with Latinism, and do not hesitate to contradict their teaching.)[2]

For these, then, nothing has been defined, there has been no new dogma since 787. The sole organ of infallibility of the Church is the Ecumenical Council.

Such is, according to law, the true position of the Greco-Russian Church from the dogmatic point of view. However the dissidents have not become cognizant of this situation until a rather recent date. It is especially as a consequence of the unionist conferences they held at the end of the last century with the Old Catholics of Döllinger that they became aware of it. When they were pressed by the close argumentation of their interlocutors, they were obliged to recognize that in fact the sole criterion that they had for setting forth a list of their dogmas of faith was the definition of the Ecumenical Council, and that it alone constituted an organ of infallibility. One of the most loyal affirmations which we have found on this point is that of Constantine Dyovouniotis, at present professor in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Athens. Dealing precisely with the possibilities of union of Oriental Orthodoxy with Old Catholicism he wrote in the Greek review *Theologia* (θεολογία April-June, 1926, pp. 172-173) the following passage:

2) We cite, in this regard, the words of the professor of the University of Athens, Hamilcar Alivisatos, delivered to the first Congress of Orthodox Theologians, held at Athens, from November 29 to December 6, 1936: "I am certain," he said, "that today no orthodox theologian whose orthodox conscience is really free of all influence could ever admit that the confessions, as they have been published, represent the true orthodox conception and the true orthodox doctrine. Because it is manifest that in spite of their doctrines, for the most part orthodox, they present more or less evident traces of Catholic or Protestant influence and often contain doctrines deriving from these sources." (*Proces-verbaux of the first Congress of Orthodox Theology,* Athens, 1939, p. 64.)

"In my estimation," he says, "union with the Old Catholics or of any other Church with the Oriental Church is impossible on a dogmatic basis, for the good reason that the *totality of the dogmatic doctrine of the Oriental Church has not been officially determined.* As is well known, the ancient Church, for reasons which did not depend upon its will, fixed none but the dogmatic points which concern the Trinitarian and Christological doctrine by the ecumenical synods; but it left undetermined the other dogmatic teachings, which still remain thus without being precised in the Oriental Church. The official determination of these other dogmas is without any doubt, *absolutely necessary. But according to the principles which reign in the Church, this determination cannot be made excepting by an Ecumenical Council assembled after the indispensable preparatory labors.* Only after the fixing of the dogmas of the Oriental Church by an ecumenical synod could there be question of union of Churches. Only then will the dogmas of the Oriental Church be officially determined, and will it be no longer possible to propose, as basis of union, individual theological opinions, often diametrically opposed to the doctrine of the Oriental Church."

Much could be said on this declaration of the Greek theologian. We shall concern ourselves only with what he tells us on the state of indetermination in which the dogmatic doctrine of the Greco-Russian Church is now found on all that which has not been clearly fixed by the ancient councils. (The same state of indetermination has been recognized by the Greco-Russian Theologians assembled in conference at Athens from November 29 to December 3, 1936.[3] while certain retarded individuals were of the opinion that there was actually no dogmatic question to be determined within the mind of oriental orthodoxy, others seemed to throw overboard all the theological work accomplished in the autocephalic churches since the separation from Rome for the reason that the dissident theology had undergone the influence at one time of Catholicism, and at another of Protestantism, and that it was necessary to return to the source of true orthodoxy, namely, to the teaching of the Fathers. Thus we return to 787!)

The Proof de Facto

The proof de jure of our assertion that: from the side of the Greco-Russians there does not exist any definitive solution on all the doctrinal questions which have been the object of discussion and of controversy between the two Churches since the separation, is then well established, since none of the seven first Ecumenical Councils, the sole recognized by the dissident Church, have attempted to settle them directly. This theoretic proof is admirably confirmed by the question de facto, namely by the history of dissident theology since the separation. This history teaches us the following:

The Greco-Russian Church, throughout the long centuries of schism,

3) Echos d'Orient, vol. XXXVI (1937), p. 225-238: *The First Congress of Orthodox Theology,* Athens, Nov. 29-Dec. 3, 1936, by E. Stephanon.

not only has not been able to resolve in a definitive way any of the questions controverted with the Catholic Church, but also it has presented on each of these questions the spectacle of continual variations in its official declarations as well as in the teachings of its theologians.

Among the opinions upheld by these latter on each point, the Catholic thesis always figures with a considerable, and sometimes preponderant, number of representatives.

A detailed demonstration of this conclusion would require a large volume. Let it suffice to give here, by way of example, a short resumé of the variations on the principal question controverted since Photius, namely, the procession of the Holy Ghost. At the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787, the Patriarch of Constantinople, St. Tarasius, who was in fact the uncle of Photius, had the profession of faith read which he had already sent to the other patriarchs at the time of his enthronement. It stated that *The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Faher through the Son.* The Council found no objection to this affirmation which the other patriarchs had already accepted, and covered it with the approbation of its silence. Less than a century later Photius claimed that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father only, and qualified as detestable heretics the Latins who confessed that the Holy Ghost *proceeds from the Father and from the Son,* while he maintained the most complete silence on the formula of his uncle: *He proceeds from the Father through the Son.*

After the death of Photius, the Orient remained silent on this question for more than 150 years. It was taken up again under Michael Cerularius. From this epoch the Byzantine polemicists attempted to accord the formula of St. Tarasius: *He proceeds from the Father through the Son* with that of his nephew, Photius: *He proceeds from the Father alone.* One must admit that the task was not easy, because if He proceeds from the Father through the Son, who can be made to believe that He proceeds from the Father alone? The polemicists nevertheless attempted this venture. But if one wishes to know how many divergent and more or less contradictory explanations they proposed of the formula *He proceeds from the Father through the Son* which was used not only by St. Tarasius, but also by the greater part of the Greek Fathers and by some Latin Fathers, the number was exactly fifteen. Among the fifteen is found the Catholic explanation given by the Council of Florence in the decree of union. A certain number of ancient Byzantine theologians have accepted this explanation, and in our days several Russian theologians admit it. (Among the former we point out Nicetas of Nicomedia in his discussions with the Latin Anselm of Havelberg, Nicetas of Maronia, Archbishop of Thessalonica, in the middle of the twelfth century, in his *Dialogues on the Procession of the Holy Ghost;* the learned monk Nicephorus Blemmydes (+1272) on two dogmatic letters to his friends; the historian George Pachymeres, in a pamphlet. Unionist theologians of the highest rank must

be added, who after having adhered for a certain time to the Photian heresy became convinced through their personal studies of the truth of the Catholic dogma and renounced the schism publicly. Such are the Patriarch John Veccos and his companions George the Metochite and Constantine of Melitene, Barlaam of Calabria, Demetrius Cydones, Manuel Calecas, the Cardinal Bessarion, the Cardinal Isidore of Kiev, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory Mammas. As for contemporary Russian theologians who, through examination of patristic tradition have come to the same conclusion as the ancients of Latin tendency and unionists of the Byzantine period, the principal ones are John of Cronstadt (+1908), who enjoys a reputation of sanctity among his compatriots, P. Svietlov, one of the most highly reputed and fruitful theologians of the twentieth century, P. Leporskij, A. Brilliantov and the Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov who was professor of dogma at the Russion Theological Institute of Paris and died in 1944.[4])

Thus, in former times as today, there have been in the midst of the Greco-Russian Church noted theologians in rather large number who have publicly professed the Catholic doctrine on the procession of the Holy Ghost which was denounced by Photius at the end of the ninth century as an abominable heresy. These theologians have not been excommunicated; they have continued and still continue to belong to the *Orthodox* Church! But much more, the Russian Church has considered one of them as a saint, and the directing Holy Synod of St. Petersburg in 1912 gave an unequivocal approbation in its official organ *Ecclesiastical News* to the doctrine defined at the councils of Lyons and of Florence!

But, the same Russian Holy Synod had just a few years before promulgated by one of its official commissions two other divergent explanations of the same formula: *The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son.* (February 23, 1893, responding to the Old Catholics with whom they had opened unionistic conferences, the Synodal Commission, after having expressly rejected the Catholic dogma, left in suspense the question of knowing whether the formula referred only to the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost through the Son, or whether it indicated *a sort of eternal manifestation of the Holy Ghost through the Son or as passing through the Son,* a very obscure theory invented at the end of the thirteenth century by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory of Cyprus (1283-1289) and diverging manifestly from the Photian doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone.)

August 8, 1897, four years later, the same Commission in a second response again showed its leaning toward the theory of the eternal manifestation. However, in a third response given ten years later, July 19, 1907, it made a complete reversal of opinion. The Commission made its own the

4) Sergius Bulgakov has a special theory on the divine processions which do not enter into the framework either of the Catholic or Photian doctrine. However, he finds no difficulty in using the formula: *The Holy Ghost is the bond which unites the Father and the Son.*

audacious theses of a famous Russian theologian, Basil Bolotov, professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of St. Petersburg (+1900). He had published them in 1898 under the veil of anonymity. He declared therein: (1) that the question of the *Filioque* had not been the cause of separation of the Churches and could not constitute a diriment impediment to their reunion; (2) that the theory of Photius on the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Patre solo* should be classed with the *theologoumena,* that is, among the theological opinions which one is free to accept or reject; (3) that it was necessary to class similarly the Latin doctrine of the Procession *a Patre et Filio* accepted in the Occident from the time of St. Augustine, and then to consider it a *theologoumenon,* a free opinion and perfectly acceptable; (4) that finally the true significance of the formula of the Greek Fathers: *The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son* did not accord either with the Photian *theologoumenon* or with the Latin *theologoumenon,* but indicated simply that the generation of the Son precedes logically, that is, by simply priority of nature, the procession of the Holy Ghost; that the Son is as the *conditio sine qua non* of the production of the Holy Ghost by the Father.)

In the space of nineteen years, from 1893 to 1912, the Russian Holy Synod, then, has changed its opinion on the Procession of the Holy Ghost three times, and in that it has only imitated the ancient Byzantine Theologians. The other twelve divergent explanations of the *per Filium* invented by them should now be passed in review. We shall be kind to the reader and be satisfied in saying that the anti-Catholic polemicists have found a way of replacing the preposition *through* in the formula: *He proceeds from the Father through the Son,* at one time with the preposition *with,* at another with the preposition *after,* at another with the preposition *according to,* and again with the preposition *in.* Others have understood in all cases the formula of the temporal sending of the Holy Ghost through the Son, even when the context is in manifest opposition to it.

Is it not true that if there is a point which the Byzantine Church should have settled definitively a long time ago, it is that of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the object of so many controversies, the barrier against which all attempts of union have been shattered? She has tried several times, but has never succeeded because the schism has deprived it of all infallible magisterium. Nothing is more illustrative of its incapacity to determine any controversy at all as are these perpetual variations on the first and principal of the dogmatic questions debated since the origin of the schism.

We have sketched an exposition in regard to the Procession of the Holy Ghost. A similar exposition could be made for the other questions: the Primacy of St. Peter and of the Pope, for the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, for the question of the Epiklesis, for Purgatory, for the moment when retribution begins in the next world, even for the azymes, if one should wish to make a dogmatic question of it.

This radical incapacity of the Greco-Russian Church to define anything whatsoever has ended in a result which is curious enough. It is this: Each theologian, each polemicist has substituted himself for the Church in defining *orthodoxy*. Since the Church is not infallible, each theologian becomes infallible. Each one proposes his individual opinion as the expression of the true, of the sole orthodoxy, obligatory for everybody. This is the phenomenon which the history of Greco-Russian theology reveals to us, and which has made more than one dupe among our own theologians, and is still making them. Because one has read in a certain manual of Greek or Russian Theology, for example that of Macarius Bulgakov which had the good fortune to be translated into French in the last century, that the Greco-Russian Church teaches the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, that she denies the Immaculate Conception or Purgatory, he accepts these affirmations as the expression of the reality. He then writes, and it is repeated: "The Greco-Russian Church rejects the Catholic doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son; she denies the Immaculate Conception and Purgatory." Nothing, however, is farther from the truth. The truth is this: In the Greco-Russian Church there are many theologians who teach the heresy of Photius. But there are some others who hold a considerably different thesis and some who hold the Catholic thesis. Likewise on Purgatory: A certain number of Greco-Russian theologians explicitly deny the Catholic dogma of Purgatory and teach that the object of prayer for the dead is to free some few souls from Hell, or to mitigate their punishments, or simply to console the living. But a greater number of others accept all that is essential in Catholic dogma, as did the Greeks at Florence. This is why, when Greco-Russian doctrine is spoken of with reference to the controverted questions and many others too, one must refrain from dealing in general and universal propositions and replace these with particular propositions. One must say that *in the Greco-Russian Church there are those who think in this way, and there are those who have another opinion.* We who are Catholics are easily led to imagine the Greco-Russian Church—this singular which covers a plural—according to the model of our own Church which is truly one and which possesses a definitively terminated doctrine on most theological questions. We forget that the Greco-Russians are twelve centuries behind the times, that they are still at the year 787. It would be the same as comparing a well unified and centralized European nation to a feudal state, for instance to Morocco before the French conquest.

Certain dissident theologians have clearly perceived this almost inevitable default of the private theologians or the particular synods of the autocephalic Churches of the Byzantine rite in presenting their personal opinions as the very expression of the teaching of their Church, and of what they call *orthodoxy*. Some of them have denounced it as well as anyone could hope to do it. Not long ago the famous Russian canonist Souvorov declared in his

Manual of Ecclesiastical Law (4th ed., Moscow, 1912, p. 212): "*Among us, that which is called orthodoxy is not very clear.*" Another, Molojsky, had written in 1907 in the Russian review, *Century* (Viek, 1907, no. 25, col. 391) something more clearly to the point: "Among us there is not one orthodoxy, but different orthodoxies. Orthodoxy assumes special properties for each individual. Briefly, there are as many orthodoxies as there are noted theologians in the orthodox world." Basil Bolotov, of whom we spoke above in treating of the procession of the Holy Ghost, in a letter written in 1899 to the director of the *International Review of Theology* to respond to the attacks against him by certain Russian theologians, unmasked the false orthodoxies of the private theologians in much more vivid terms:

"Gousseff and the theologians of his school make the great mistake not only of identifying their ideas with those of the entire Church, but also of accusing those who permit themselves to have ideas different from their own, of infidelity to the Church and treason. 'All that we have said and all that we say on the *Filioque* and transubstantiation,' these gentlemen affirm, 'ought to be affirmed and repeated by all the Orthodox if they know the doctrine of their Church and if they do not wish to be traitors to their faith.' No. It is the contrary which is true. It is these gentlemen who, in wishing *per fas et nefas* to approve the particular, the local and the temporary as against the general, the universal and the eternal in the Church, it is they, I say, who fall into error and who are unfaithful to the universal Church and to truth." (*International Review of Theology,* 1899, p. 585.)

Likewise, the Greek, Constantine Dyovouniotis, whom we have heard tell us that nothing has been determined in the Greco-Russian theology since 787, also recognizes the subjectivism of the particular theologians and excuses them in these terms:

"As long as the doctrine of the Orthodox Church is not officially determined, private theologians find themselves obliged to make it explicit at their own risk and peril, and in this individual interpretation it is psychologically impossible for them to exclude the personal conceptions which they propose as the belief of the whole Church . . .; and thus it comes about that something unheard of enters the Oriental Church."[5]

Practical Conclusions to Be Drawn from the Foregoing

We are now duly warned and sufficiently informed on the real state of the Greco-Russian Theology relative to the questions which are controverted between the two Churches. This is quite apparent: From the side of the dissidents these questions cannot constitute a real dogmatic barrier which

5) *Theologia* , 1926, p. 174; Concerning the phenomenon we speak of, the reader may learn for himself by comparing the various doctrines of certain contemporary emigrant Russian theologians at Paris; for example, the theories of Sergius Bulgakov, developed in his dogmatic trilogy: *The Lamb of God, The Paraclete, The Spouse of the Lamb* with the views of Vladimir Lossky in his *Essay on the Mystic Theology of the Oriental Church*, Paris, 1944. Neither one nor the other of these theologians represent the common doctrine of the Oriental Church as it is expressed in the manuals in use in the Russian Church before the Soviet period.

would impede them from accession to the Catholic Church, since there is not, in fact, among them anything but opinions on these points, and there is nothing that is officially defined. One can say that this situation is eminently favorable to union. For a faithful of the Greco-Russian Church there is nothing easier than to effect his reunion with the Catholic Church; he may simply walk into the fold of Peter. The door is left open for him in this direction by the very teachings of his own Church. Holding what she proposes as truly having a dogmatic character and being objectively orthodox, namely the definitions of the seven first Ecumenical Councils, he need only complete this central nucleus of orthodoxy with the collection of all the revealed truths defined as such by the Catholic Church since 787. Then he will be truly and completely orthodox: he will be Catholic. Moreover, he will make this passage to the fold of Peter in good company. He will have with him not only the greater part of the Greek and Latin Fathers and a number of ancient Popes like St. Leo the Great, St. Gregory the Great, St. Martin I, whose feasts are still celebrated by the Greco-Russian Church at the present time, but also a good number of the most outstanding dissident theologians who have held throughout the centuries, or still hold, the Catholic teaching on these famous questions which have far too long been used as an insurmountable wall of separation between the Oriental and Occidental Christians. Two examples may well suffice to illustrate this affirmation:

We know a Byzantine theologian of the fifteenth century, equally learned in oriental and occidental theology, who at his time did not find more than two serious divergences in the dogmatic order between the two Churches: namely, the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost and that of the real distinction between the divine essence and its operation (a question of Palamism). The name of this theologian is George Scholarios. It is he who, under the name of Gennadius II, was the first Patriarch of Constantinople after the taking of that city by the Turks. He died shortly after in 1472. Among the Greeks of our days, there are none who would take it upon themselves to doubt his orthodoxy and to catalogue him among the heterodox. Yet George teaches explicitly the Catholic doctrine on the Primacy of the Pope, on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, on particular judgment and retribution immediately after death, on Purgatory, on the form of the Eucharist, which is constituted by the words of Institution alone, making abstraction of the formula called epiklesis of the Holy Ghost. As for the two points which presented difficulty for him and impeded union with the Latins, they do not exist, so to speak, in our day. This is evidently the case for the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost according to what we have said above. As for the Palamistic question, it is a long time now since it has ceased to arouse interest. The Russians practically renounced it in the eighteenth century when they entirely modified the office of the Sunday of Orthodoxy (first Sunday of Lent) and eradicated all mention of the

Palamitic doctrines. Moreover, the Greek and Russian theological manuals in use in the Seminaries and Universities take the contrary view of these doctrines and are in accord with Catholic theology. If George returned to earth there would be no more reason for separation from the Catholics since authentic *Orthodox* are likewise in agreement with them on the two points mentioned.

The other example is furnished by the liturgical books of the Byzantine Church. Among the ancient Popes whose memory is solemnly celebrated by that Church is found St. Leo the Great, whose doctrine on the procession of the Holy Ghost is known, and especially, his doctrine is known on the primacy of Divine Right and the Infallibility of the Successor of Peter. On February 18, in the office of Vespers, Leo is greeted as the unconquerable tower of religion, the guide of *orthodoxy,* the torch of the earth, the lyre of the Holy Ghost. At the office of *Orthros,* or of Lauds, he is proclaimed as the heir to the throne of Peter the Koruphaios (head), his successor enriched with his Primacy, who has erected the column of orthodoxy in the Church of Christ. He is compared to a lion who has pursued the foxes of dissension and has struck the brains of the impious with stupor by his royal roaring. He is at one time a sunrise, at another a resplendent sun which has arisen from the Occident and which has cast on all sides the rays of pure doctrine. Like a new Moses he has appeared to the people of God bearing, engraved upon tables, teachings of piety written by the hand of God. Veritable patriarch, he has set up his tent there where prelatures and the thrones of patriarchs are found. He is beseeched to watch over his flock from the heights of heaven, and to obtain for all the great mercy of Christ.

This is what is still sung at the present day at Constantinople, at Athens, at Bucarest, at Moscow, at Sophia, and elsewhere.

By this road of the teaching of the ancient Fathers, the ancient Popes and of the Byzantine Liturgy, illustrious personages who in the beginning embraced the Byzantine schism in good faith, have come to embrace the Roman Catholic Church and bringing with them all that there was of truly orthodox in the Church of their origin. We cite only three names: Barlaam of Calabria and Demetrius Cydones in the fourteenth century, Vladimir Soloviev in the nineteenth century. The latter, at the end of the preface to his work *Russia and the Universal Church,* published in 1889, indicates quite clearly the road which led him to Rome:

"As a member of the true and venerable Oriental Orthodox or Greco-Russian Church which does not speak through an anti-canonical synod, nor through the employees of a secular power, but through the voice of her great Fathers and Doctors, I recognize as supreme judge in religious matters he who has been recognized as such by St. Irenaeus, St. Denis the Great, St. Athanasius the Great, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. Flavian,

Blessed Theodoret, St. Maximus the Confessor, St. Theodore the Studite, St. Ignatius and the others—namely the Apostle Peter who lives in his successors—and who do not hear in vain the words of the Lord: '*Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church*—Confirm thy brothers—Feed my sheep, feed my lambs'."

Any faithful of the Greco-Russian Church can renew the reasoning and the gesture of Vladimir Soloviev on his own account without being accused of heterodoxy or heresy by his co-religioners if these have become cognizant of the true state of their Church which has lost the power of infallibly teaching revealed truth since her separation from Rome.

M. Jugie, A.A.

Notes and Information

PIUS XII REAFFIRMS RIGHTS OF CHURCH AND STATE

Sunday, February 20, the Holy Father spoke from the balcony of St. Peter's to a throng of hundred of thousands who had come to show their firm loyalty to their Church and their Pope. His speech followed upon a Mass celebrated by Mgr. Traglia, Vicegerent of Rome. He stated the principle of the Church's rights and duties in the midst of state powers which she has received from Christ and which she has practiced throughout the vicissitudes of her divinely protected history.

His Holiness stated that the Church does not mix in questions which are merely political or economical, nor does she dispute upon the utility or disadvantages of any form of government, but she seeks to maintain peace with all. "She gives to Caesar that which belongs to him according to right, but she cannot betray or abandon that which is of God."

With reference to totalitarian and anti-religious governments which force ecclesiastical institutions to the doing of their will or crush them, he said that these states "would wish: (1) a Church which is silent when it ought to speak; (2) a Church which weakens the law of God, adapting it to the good-pleasure of human wills when it ought nobly to proclaim it and defend it; (3) a Church which removes herself from the unbroken foundation upon which Christ built it, and places herself conveniently upon the shifting sand of the opinions of the day or abandons herself to the passing current; (4) a Church which does not resist the oppression of consciences and does not preserve the legitimate rights and the just liberties of the people; (5) a Church which with unworthy servility remains closed between the four walls of the temple and forgets the divine command received from Christ: *Go ye therefore into the highways;* (Matt. 22,9) *teach all nations* (Matt. 28,19). He reminded the people that such was not the Church they venerated and loved, and recalled the divine promises given to the Pope, which give certainty that he, the messenger of truth and justice, *the principle of the Church's Unity, will remain invincible, even in his human weakness.*

* * * *

THE WAY OF A CONVERT TO THE CHURCH

How can non-Catholics fail to assent to the clear, reasonable, and obviously well-founded claims of the Roman Catholic Church? Catholics, feeling the firm rock of Christ's foundation beneath their feet, easily become exasperated before what appears to be the obstinacy of Protestants, or determined upon charity, defend their good faith blindly. Looking out from within the Church, the way seems straight and clear, but the one approaching oftentimes finds it tortuous and steep. The trials of those who have endured the search merit our careful reflection, for knowledge brings indulgent under-

standing with the ability to assist more effectively those who might still be on their way.

It is not to be forgotten that a divine element, at the disposition of God alone, is closely bound up with the event of a Protestant's conversion. Since only He can lift the final veil from the Gateway of Salvation, an element of mystery must of necessity remain in the story of any individual conversion. Nevertheless, it is a mortal who makes assent to the totality of Christ's supernatural truths, and while the heart of any one human being is too deep and complex to be known with certainty, he is of our kind and falls within the measure of our powers of understanding.

Mr. Guy Gibbins, now a student for the priesthood, makes remarkably clear observations upon the delays and frustrations which beset his own way to the Catholic Church in his article *It Happened So* (The Beda Review, Sept., 1948). While still a child, he was tormented by fearsome doubts, for he could not find reasons for God's existence which would quiet the questions he proposed in his young mind. At about seventeen, he read with satisfaction Bagshawe's *Credentials of the Catholic Church*. The book actually convinced his reason; its arguments were unanswerable. Why then did he not assent to what he found to be the true faith? Proper folk, and worthy of respect, those who represent upright society had tutored him in impressive stories about the wickedness of Roman Catholics. In his mind, it would not have been a good thing, but a very wicked one to follow his reasonable convictions. Hence, Bagshawe's *Credentials* were tucked away on a hidden shelf of his memory.

He bore bravely up under his doubts and fears. He came to the day of ordination to the Anglican ministry when he was obliged to fortify more courageously and more resolutely his will to resist the fears of those rumbling uncertainties which brewed at the depths of his soul. He began to search the "labyrinthine ways" of the many beliefs and shadings of them which he came upon within and without the Established Church. At one time his faith in a saving Christ was bolstered by the zealous sermon of an Evangelical clergyman. Later, he found some enlightenment in the more Catholic doctrines which he learned as time passed. He was first encouraged and then revolted by the naive practices of the Oxford Group. One rector gave solace with his preaching of Christian charity. Another edified him by his faith in the Anglo-Catholic doctrine, but led him further toward desolation and dismay by his policy of placating with compromises. The statue of Our Lady would be shifted behind a column when the Bishop came to visit. Services were held in the Roman way for some, early in the morning, and according to the Book of Common Prayer for the older, more staid members who came later in the day. Their consciences must not be upset. He finally found himself clinging to the sheer belief in goodness and duty and trusted in these to bear him one day to the answers which would calm the questions battering his soul.

Helen Waddell's "*Lives of the Desert Fathers*" gave him a glimpse into the supernatural world. That which in the ancient hermits amuses the modern man was precisely that which gained his respect for grace. The fantastic doings of the legendary fathers of the desert prompted him to write for Catholic books, and he again became convinced of the claims of the Church.

Each turning to the Faith brought with it a sharp reversal to misbelief. He assured himself that this must be just another of his crazes for religious novelty. He forced himself to find that he was still in doubt, with the result that he began to lead a double life, officially and outwardly practicing the Anglican faith, while privately and inwardly he confessed its vanity. While he genuflected to the semblance of the Blessed Sacrament, he said in his heart that it was so much bread.

He was made rector of a handsome medieval church, but its superb lines, designed to lead the spirit of the faithful to the amplitude of piety, for him threw into relief the insufficiency of the faith practiced within it.

Its last Catholic rector of "Reformation" days seemed to haunt the impostor. After two years he sought out a Jesuit priest and was delighted and relieved to find him no spider lying in wait for a fly, not a hypnotist full of ruses, but a man in no wise formidable, without his collar, planting lettuces in his garden. As reaction he took desperate refuge in a mood of skepticism wherein he promised himself to wait. He did wait, and then bared his qualms to his bishop. To save him from the "Scarlet Lady" the bishop sent him to an able minister who had already "rescued" others like him. This friend in need could, though, offer no weighty counsel other than the notion that in remaining an Anglican he could do greater good for the Catholic Church. However, he had been studying Scholastic Logic, and logic revealed to him the harsh truth that if the Church was what it apparently was, nothing should keep him from entering it. Again he sought recourse to his bishop, and was this time confided to the hands of a psychiatrist who required him to report his dreams. It had never occurred to him that there was import or significance in dreams. He noted that certain figures and situations recurred persistently in them, and when Gibbins focused his attention upon them he found there such a forceful, clearly incised picture of the thoughts and ideas which pursued him that he could no longer escape their impact.

It was the psychiatrist then, who, without willing it, pried open the door that he had been trying to hold shut upon the straight path to the Catholic Church. From that moment he allowed nothing to impede his progress direct to instruction in the Faith and entrance to the Church which Christ had founded upon Peter the Rock.

* * * *

THE BRIGITTINE SISTERS CONSECRATED TO UNITY

The Order of the Brigittine Sisters of the Most Holy Saviour, founded

by St. Bridget of Sweden, seems to be predestined to travel the roads of Union with the Church and to serve, God willing, as a link binding Sweden, their land of origin, with Rome, where the foundress lived twenty-five years of her life, where she wrote her *Revelations* and from which she passed to the glory of the Blessed.

The Order has had a new beginning—even in Sweden where the Lutheran revolution destroyed the monastic institutions—through the faith and the zeal of the present Mother Abbess General, Elisabeth Hesselblad, a convert to the Church of Peter. We have spoken of a certain predestination. Mother Elisabeth as a child, and pupil of the Lutheran Sunday Schools, felt in her heart a call for the cause of Unity. Her Lutheranism did not suggest the ecumenical idea to her, but in her heart a divine voice repeated "one Fold, and one Shepherd." Where could this divine Guide of all Christians be found? Where was the reality of "one heart and one soul"? The little Lutheran became a young lady. At 17 she left Sweden for the United States, where after lengthy study and years of struggle, the Good Shepherd, Whose presence she had sensed among the pines of Sweden, took her by the hand and led her into His Fold. After her conversion concern for the Unity of her brothers in Christ still burned in her heart. She longed for the coming of her brothers still outside the Fold. Already at Rome in 1905 she had printed a prayer for Unity. In 1946 she offered space in her convent buildings for the Committee of UNITAS, along with the service of her Religious for the Secretariate.

Thus, besides enjoying the benefit of prayers for Union, which form the daily spiritual exercise of these pious Sisters, the family of UNITAS today come together for their work under the shadow of the cells of St. Bridget and St. Catherine, who spent their lives in an endeavor to bring the Papacy back to Rome from Avignon, and who throughout a great part of northern Europe represented the flower of monastic religious life, as they did at the center of Christianity, at the Throne of the One Shepherd, bond and prophecy of the return of their people to the Holy See.

* * * *

THE CHURCH AND THE WORKERS

Dr. S. Bolshakoff in The Bulletin (January, 1949) reports opinions of workers in this age of mass-production and spiritual suppression: The problem of mass-production must be solved if civilization is to continue, and the principal obstacle to industrial progress is psychological. Monotonous, meaningless work dulls the minds of the workers and makes robots of them. Strikes have as a partial motive rebellion against inhuman and soul-destroying work, since intelligent workers resent degradation. Others find escape from the depressing monotony in stunts and excitement, commercialized sport, cinema, gambling, and violent political movements.

One can with no difficulty recognize in these remarks some of the attributes of the anti-Christian movements which for convenience sake are called Communistic, but which would exist in some form if Marx and Stalin had never been—as in fact they existed even before these symbols of modern chaos were born, as we will remember from our books on the French Revolution.

Dr. Bolshakoff writes: "A great deal could indeed be done if monotonous mass-production work could be considered not as a kind of penal servitude but as a noble and necessary self-sacrificing work for society. This cannot be done unless the working-class is first Christianized. The problem of the reconquest of the workers for Christ must be the first preoccupation of the Church in all industrialized countries. This problem is by no means insoluble. There is no hatred of Christ, or even of the Church among the workers, merely ignorance. Once services, classes, sermons, and so forth, are arranged for them by the management and conducted by clergy who know the working class, its mentality, interest and sorrows, the result is usually good and promising."

It might be remarked that since Christ chose workers to found his Church and put a Fisherman at the head of it, and in view of the fact that St. Francis with his Minori, making common cause with the popular class, brought fresh life to the Church, the Church is in no wise out of character when she mothers the workers through Priests and Religious who succeed in reaching their interest through a real sympathy with their condition.

* * * *

UNESCO AND MATERIALISM

The Anglican Bishop of Chichester, Rt. Rev. G. K. A. Bell, speaking as a supporter of UNESCO in the House of Lords' debate, January 26, drew attention to the danger of a policy which gives a preponderant place to science and scientific technique, exemplified in the large sums assigned to such purposes by UNESCO, and the utter neglect of subsidies toward religious ends. He said, "I have no wish to belittle science in the promotion of human welfare, or the estimable boons it confers on backward people, but I do quarrel with the idea that the more science there is in the world the better the world becomes; and in the report of the late Director-General and the attitude behind the programme for 1949 which he has helped to formulate, I do detect too a great belief in the perfect ability of man by material means, and too little sense of spiritual factors . . . the breach of the communion between the spiritual and the rational order is the most formidable problem that confronts the modern world . . . in my opinion UNESCO in its operation and its whole approach to cultures, should recognise the place held by religion in culture. . . ." (EPS)

"PROGRESSIVE CHRISTIANS"

The *Osservatore Romano,* under date of January 30, made a statement in response to a manifesto issued by the Central Committee of the "Progressive Christians," in which it is said, ". . . as the Manifesto affirms the complete Catholic orthodoxy of the organizers of the movement, we must remark that only ecclesiastical authority is the judge of Catholic orthodoxy. As the Church has several times declared, the principles and tendencies shown by the promoters of the movement, and their alliance with groups inspired by materialistic atheism, are not in conformity with Catholic doctrine and the teachings of the Holy See. It is therefore desirable to draw the attention of the faithful to this subject, and to warn them not to join movements of this nature, or to withdraw from them if they already belong. We are sure that this warning will be heeded without it being necessary to resort to further measures." These "Progressive Christians" nurture the doctrine that American imperialism, whose aim is anti-Sovietism, is the renaissance of fascism. In the conclusion of its manifesto, the group had made clear the paradoxical platform it would preach of remaining Christian while abetting an aggressively atheistic cause. According to the Manifesto, the choice of the "Progressive Christians" is clearly "to fight in and with the 'Progressive' movement where in the front rank is the Communist Party and Soviet Russia, against whom the assaults of imperialism are directed."

In France, Cardinal Suhard, the Archbishop of Paris, followed the *Osservatore's* statement with one of his own in which he establishes the fundamental absurdity of Christians cooperating with Communists. They risk giving assent to doctrines condemned by the Church and contributing to the success of the Communist Party. In concluding he declares that the Church cannot allow any habitual or far-reaching collaboration. "She invites the Faithful to elaborate their thought and conduct their activities without contaminating themselves with thought and action whose fundamental principles are in contradiction to theirs on so many points, even in social and political matters."

OCTAVE OF PRAYER FOR UNITY

The Octave of Prayer for Unity between the Feast of the Chair of Peter, January 18 and the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, January 25, has perhaps been observed more widely and with more fervent interest than ever before. At Rome the Octave was observed with great solemnity at the Church of the Gesu under the direction of the Friars of the Atonement. A number of Cardinals presided over the functions, and the sermons were delivered by the most celebrated orators. The Octave was also observed as usual at the Paulist Church of St. Susanna in different languages.

Other outstanding observances were at Bologna, Palermo, and Milan. All parishes of Emilia have been requested by the Archbishop of Bologna to observe this week of prayer. In Italy, as throughout the Catholic world, prayers were offered in countless religious houses and seminaries. France showed zealous interest in the Octave of Prayer, especially at Paris, Lyons, and Lille. The laity in France has begun to feel its responsibility in this work and is showing initiative. It was a time of great prayer activity in England where the British Catholic Press is to be congratulated for the generous space devoted to it.

The Octave has had wide and impressive observance in the United States. It was celebrated with great solemnity at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at Washington and at the Church of the Blessed Sacrament at New York. Solemn public observances were held in the Cathedrals of many American cities, including Chicago, St. Paul, Buffalo, Altoona, St. Cloud, and New Orleans.

The Protestants have also taken advantage of this Octave to concentrate their earnest appeals to God for the way to Unity. The Commission of Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches has made an appeal to all those interested in its work for special prayers. Rev. Oliver Tompkins, its Secretary, writes, "This year the appeal comes out of a new setting which is full of promise for the healing of divided Christendom and yet a setting which also reminds us of barriers not yet surmounted and of threats to all that Christians value." He continues with petitions for the many phases of Unity so desired by them and by us.

* * * *

DUTCH APOSTOLATE FOR UNION

Notable among the astonishingly vigorous unionistic movements in a world which is striving to wrench itself apart is the Apostolate for Union, *Het Apostolaat der Hereniging*. The Most Reverend Andrew Sheptytsky, Metropolitan of Lwow, arrived in Holland in April of 1921. Encouraged by Pope Benedict XV and by His Eminence Cardinal van Rossum, he asked the aid of the Dutch for his Apostolate among the Ukrainians. The movement came to devote itself to the Ruthenian mission, and the Apostolate was born. Toward the end of 1926 some groups interested in the Christian Orient gathered at Schootenhof (near Anvers) to establish one sole organization for union; and in the beginning of 1927 *the Apostolate for Union* was founded. Its Constitutions were approved by the Hierarchy who in 1936 recommended its organization in *each parish*. The movement has grown mightily and now numbers 187,875 members.

The President, Rev. A. G. Smit, Pastor of Soestdijk, is assisted by a

central committee made up of secular and regular clergy and laymen as well. The organization is administered by a national director, at present the Rev. Fr. Franz Wijnhoven, A.A. Each diocese has its director.

The purpose of the Apostolate for Union is the return of all the Churches of Orient and Occident to the Mother Church. The Apostolate is affiliated with the *Catholica Unio* whose purpose is to favor oriental vocations and assist oriental seminaries. Some months ago a Ukrainian Seminary was opened at Culemborg through the work of the Apostolate.

Het Apostolaat seeks to cultivate better understanding of the Oriental Christians through a periodical entitled *De Roepstem uit het Oosten* (The Voice of the Orient), which it distributes free of charge.

A few months ago the Assumptionist Fathers initiated another review entitled *Het Christelik Oosten en Hereniging* (Christian Orient and Union) destined for the more educated people of the Netherlands and the Flemish regions.

A healthy sign of the unity trends in Holland is the energetic participation of laymen, since it is they who have daily, live contact with other Christians.

* * * *

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches met at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, near Geneva, from February 8 to 10; it was presided over by the Anglican Bishop of Chichester. Three of the six presidents of the World Council were present: Dr. Marc Boegner, President of the French Protestant Federation, Archbishop Germanos, Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Western Europe, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church in the United States, with nine members of the Executive Committee.

The Committee discussed, among other things, the meeting of the Central Committee composed of 90 members in Chichester in July. They issued a Message on the basic principles of human rights and religious freedom which are at the present time being impeded and gravely threatened, as they are in numerous countries of Europe and Asia. (EPS)

* * * *

EFFORTS OF UNITY BETWEEN ANGLICAN AND FREE CHURCHES

An announcement issued from Lambeth Palace at Christmas says that representatives of the Church of England and the Free Churches have reached provisional agreements over a wide range of beliefs. An interim report has been agreed upon which is to be submitted to the Archbishop of

Canterbury and the Free Church authorities. The report follows upon talks held at High Leigh, Hertfordshire, where the bearing of the Lambeth conference report on the problem of unity was discussed. The conference "reaffirmed its conviction that the method of approach to the problem of unity suggested by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his sermon at Cambridge in 1946 (as contrasted with projects for immediate constitutional reunion) was the right one to pursue in this country." In his Cambridge sermon, the Anglican Archbishop had suggested that the approach to union between the Churches should not be along the line of organic union but by the recovery of a common ministry acceptable to all the Churches, even before organic unity is reached. This would involve the acceptance of episcopacy by the Free Churches as a step towards unity even before that unity is finally secured.

* * * *

UNITY PROJECT BETWEEN CONGREGATIONALISTS AND PRESBYTERIANS

A questionnaire has been sent to the Congregationalist communities in England on the project of union with the Presbyterians. A mixed committee has launched this project which has not been set in form to be voted upon. The Congregationalists are invited to express their opinion which will be taken into consideration in future conferences.

* * * *

MEETING OF FRENCH AND GERMAN PASTORS

An ecumenical meeting took place in Le Chambon-sur-Lignon from January 7 to 19, under the auspices of the Mission of Fellowship to the Churches of Europe of the American Board of Missions (Congregational). Thirteen French pastors were host to as many German Evangelical ministers from several synods in the Rhineland. The theme: *What Christ is saying to His Church today concerning man, the world, and the Church itself.* A solid theological exchange was carried out, and friendship was established in the discussion. The German pastors invited their French colleagues to continue the discussion at Meisenhem next August. (EPS)

Chronicle*

NOTES ON WORK FOR CONVERSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Naturally, if a country can claim over 115,000 converts yearly, the apostolate for conversion of the Protestants and for the reunion of the dissident Orientals is very intense. We shall leave aside those truly heroic and hidden

*) Mgr. Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D., Ph.D., National (American) Secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, Director of the St. Paul Guild, Editor of *The Epistle*, and co-chairman of the annual Fordham Conference on Eastern Rites, has generously consented to contribute a regular Chronicle for UNITAS which will relate events bearing upon Protestants, Christians of Oriental Rites and conversions.

efforts of the parish priests, only remarking that the vast proportion of the conversions are effected through the quiet apostolate of sterling priests, eager to extend the dimensions of the Lord's vineyard. We shall also leave to future chronicles many of the movements which have been responsible for the vast conversion movement in the United States. Let it be said, however, at the outset that conversions in the United States are rarely for interested reasons, that is to say, without sincerity. Some might think that because of the mixed marriages many non-Catholics are converted to please the Catholic party. These occasions are so rare throughout the United States that they could be numbered in the minimum. What does happen is that, in the instructions given before mixed marriages, on the *cautiones,* the non-Catholic party becomes convinced of the truth of the Catholic Church and enters it. I might also add here that it is essential that we Catholics, throughout the world, have a true impression of Protestants in the United States.

Although we read of the organization called "Protestants and other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State" as well as some anti-Catholic movements, the vast Protestant population of the United States lives in neighborly harmony with the Catholics, and many of these truly good people are groping for the light. How do they find it? Let us chronicle a few of the movements that help them.

The writer is a devoted admirer of the late lamented Father Paul James Francis, of the Friars of the Atonement, who founded over forty years ago the Octave of Prayer for Unity. To show the influence of this movement, founded, mind you, by a sincere Protestant Episcopalian monk, who later brought his community into the Church, we have only to point out the conversion of His Grace, Mar Ivanios, of the Malankarese Rite, who followed the prayers of the Octave years before he decided, in 1930, to come into the Church. Today Mar Ivanios of India is the leader of 70,000 converts from schism! In America, through the efforts of Father Paul's Graymoor Friars and so many others, including the writer's own Catholic Near East Welfare Association, the Unity Octave has spread throughout the world. In America, in addition to the Octave Ceremonies at the Immaculate Conception in the Catholic University in Washington, services are held in all the dioceses, and a radio program is sponsored by the Knights of Columbus throughout the nation.

Europeans may not know that in the last century a special community of priests was founded in the United States for the conversion of the Protestants. It is called the Congregation of St. Paul. For over fifty years it has given missions to non-Catholics, and it is responsible for the conversions of many non-Catholics in America. Today it sponsors a magazine called *Information,* just as the Graymoor Friars sponsor *The Lamp. Information* carries only articles dedicated to conversion, and it is today one of the most popular Catholic journals in the United States. For over half a cen-

tury the Paulists have been publishing pamphlets for non-Catholics, used by priests all over in their convert work. The Paulist Press published about five hundred million pamphlets every year for non-Catholics. In the past five years the Paulists have inaugurated in several large cities, especially New York and Boston, the so-called Information Centers, buildings with store fronts on the city streets, The inquirer may walk in from the street, attracted by the display in the window. He will meet a layman, who will tell him that if he is interested a priest will come immediately to instruct him or to speak with him of the Catholic Church. Generally this inquirer asks to see the priest whose office is in the building, and conversion results. Other Information Centers are also established in the diocesan parishes of the country.

A work which has grown to great proportion in the past three or four years is that of the *Convert Makers of America,* whose members are responsible for hundreds of pamphlet racks in public places, such as railroad stations. These pamphlets give the inquiring non-Catholic the opportunity of learning the claims of the Church, and many indeed are those whom the Convert Makers have drawn to the Church by this very active apostolate.

There is also a special apostolate to non-Catholic ministers of religion, called the *Saint Paul Guild.* Pope Pius XI called this "a unique and exquisite charity." This Guild has about ten thousand members throughout the United States, with a special headquarters at 4 East 73 Street, New York City. It was founded forty-eight years ago by Archbishop Corrigan of New York and fifteen laymen, among whom were some convert ministers. Since its foundation, the Guild has disbursed more than a hundred thousand dollars for the support of convert ministers, who on coming into the Church find it difficult to accommodate their material lives to the new world in which they must live. Of these ministers who could be numbered in the hundreds many have become priests, but those who were encumbered with families have needed the support of the Guild. At the Guild House in New York every week more than a thousand members come together for instructions and religious exercises from a chaplain always in residence. The Guild publishes a quarterly magazine *The Epistle,* which carries many articles on conversions. It also sponsors "The Hearthfire," a weekly gathering of recent converts, who continue their instructions.

As to the apostolate to the dissident Orientals, there has been a remarkable growth of Oriental Days in the United States, the most notable of which is the annual Fordham Conference on Eastern Rites, now in its eleventh year of existence. This Conference is always closed with the celebration of one of the Eastern Liturgies in the Cathedral of St. Patrick at New York, and Cardinal Spellman presides and preaches. For the past twenty-three years the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, mission aid of the Oriental Congregation, with the offices in New York, has interested the Catholics

of America in work for the Orientals, and it has published many thousands of pamphlets on the Rites and Customs of the East. Since there are in the United States more than half a million Catholics of Eastern Rite, and a corresponding number of dissidents, there is a vast field of labor reunion.

Many other movements for the conversion of non-Catholics in America will suggest themselves in the future. When one considers the special Home Mission Societies, such as Extension, founded for this work, the chapel cars and buses which go into the smaller communities where there are few or no Catholics, the huge sums of money allocated by the Catholic Bishops for all conversion works, we may well imagine that one hundred and fifteen thousand and more converts every year are the result of much devotion and unified labor, and that the many programs and organizations fit into a beautiful picture of apostolic zeal for souls in a country with a really white harvest.

MSGR. THOMAS J. MCMAHON

Around the World

ROME

THE POPE AFTER THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL: MASS OF EXPIATION

Following upon the sacrilegious trial and condemnation of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, on February 11, issued an Apostolic exhortation to the Bishops and Ordinaries of the world in which he calls upon all Christians to work intensely for the triumph of Christ, especially through expiation. He makes clear the significance of this attack against this Hungarian Prince of the Church. It has its root in original sin. He says, "that proud heedlessness and disdain of divine things which was the first crime of man, rebellious to the divine command, and which is the most befouled source of all crimes" spreads like a contagious pestilence contaminating the whole world. It is attacking most viciously certain regions in these days where it is fomenting a conspiracy "against the Lord and against His Christ." (Ps. 2,2) It robs man of his dignity, makes him the slave of matter, and suffocates virtue, love, hope, and beauty of the interior life. This is the work of atheism, or hatred of God. He calls upon the faithful to enter into a holy contest for the defense of the worship of God Whom the angels adore trembling. They should raise the banner of St. Michael and repeat his cry: "Who is like unto God?" He quotes St. Thomas on the supreme gravity of the offense: "the hatred of God is, greater than any other, a sin against the Holy Ghost," (S.Thom.,Sum.Theol.

2-2, q.34, art. 2 ad 1), hence the most grievous of sins, and from which is to be expected the most severe chastisements.

He cites practical means of reawakening zeal for religion, of erecting a defense against, and of applying a remedy for, the wickedness of God's enemies: penitence and prayer—the prayer of the innocent, penitent Christian, followed by good works, can obtain all things. He quotes Tertullian: "Prayer is the wall of Faith, and our weapon of defense against the enemy who watches us from every side." The prayer *par excellence* is the Eucharistic Sacrifice which propitiates the Father through the offering of the immolated Son upon the Cross. This "truly propitiatory sacrifice," he explains in the words of the Council of Trent, is efficaciously performed "for sins, punishments, satisfactions and every other necessity" (C. of Tr., Sess. XXII, 2 & 3). Since, then, atheism and hatred of God give reason to fear the chastisements due to the most grievous sin, we must wash away and destroy the consequences and prepare a splendid triumph for the Church through the cleansing stream of the Blood of Christ contained in the Chalice of the New Testament.

Hence, he permits and exhorts all Bishops with their Priests to celebrate a second Mass on Passion Sunday of this year which will be a votive Mass in remission of sins—*In Osorum Dei Criminis Expiationem*—and according to his express intention. Exceptions would be those Masses which would need to be offered for the intention of the Bishop or of the people. If anyone should not, for any reason, take advantage of this privilege, he should celebrate the Mass of the Sunday and at least fervently recommend to God the intentions of the Holy Father in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The faithful, in their character of members of Christ's Mystical Body, should be invited to flock to the altars that Sunday, and fully cognizant of the gravity and importance of the cause, pray and supplicate God. They are likewise urged to receive Holy Communion.

TO THE CONSISTORY OF CARDINALS

The Holy Father, in an allocution delivered at an Extraordinary Secret Consistory held on February 14, extolled the sterling Christian virtue of Cardinal Mindszenty, affirmed the falsity of the statements made at his trial, and indicated the purpose of that trial in a Scriptural quotation: "I will strike the shepherd: and the sheep of the flock shall be dispersed." (Matt. 26,31) Christ is being attacked in this faithful Shepherd of His flock. He emphasized that the sacred principles of religion were the sole which could establish the equitable duties of citizens, make firm the foundations of the State, and furnish virtuous morals according to salutary norms. He gave counsel for those who bear the responsibility of government. They should base their actions upon the true and certain doctrine of the Christian Faith. He emphasized the duty of rulers with a quotation from the great statesman and orator Cicero: "High priests, with the fortification of religion,

you gird your city even more securely than with its walls." (De Nat. Deor. III,40)

THE POPE RECEIVES MEMBERS OF BRITISH PARLIAMENT

On January 11, the Holy Father received a group of 18 British law makers who came to Rome to return a visit made by members of the Italian parliament to the British legislature. In addressing them he said, "Knowledge and sympathetic understanding are an essential condition to break down the barriers and prejudices which divide peoples and cause bitter strife."

* * * *

ENGLAND

USE OF ENGLISH IN LITURGY

The British Hierarchy in the last Low Week meeting discussed the problem of the use of English in certain liturgical ceremonies. No conclusions were attempted, but the need of clearing up misunderstandings and half-truths was demonstrated as being an essential preparation to a wise handling of the matter. The report approved by His Eminence Bernard Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop of Westminster, says, "there may be, as indeed there are, reasons for retaining a Latin liturgy, but among those reasons we cannot admit the contention that a vernacular liturgy would be a threat to the unity and universality of the Church. The statement is demonstrably false, and if we can succeed in nailing this falsehood to the counter, we shall have deserved well of those who wish to argue the question on its proper merits; in other words, to examine whether it may not be to the greater good of souls to have a liturgy in which one can, in the words of the Pope, 'actively and intelligently praticipate,' in place of one that discourages active participation and makes it next to impossible for the great majority of our people. . . ."

CHURCH ATTENDANCE IN ENGLAND

Public opinion polls of daily newspapers agree on the following estimates of church attendance in England: regular church-goers, 15 to 20%; occasional church-goers, a further two fifths; non-church-goers, the remaining two fifths. The "faithful fifth" of church-goers is evenly distributed among the various groups.

The proportion of the population shown as *ever going to church* is: Church of England 60%, Free Church 20%, Church of Scotland 10%, Roman Catholics 10%. *Regular church-goers:* Free Church, twice as big a proportion as Anglicans; Roman Catholics, twice as big a proportion as the Free Churches. Free Churches and Roman Catholics draw their members more largely from the lower income groups than the Church of England.

Proportion of members under 25 years of age: Roman Catholics have the largest proportion, Free Churches the smallest. (EPS)

A recent observer has placed the question of whether the problem in England is not so much winning Anglicans to the Church founded on Peter as it is converting England to Christianity.

* * * *

GERMANY

A NEW PROBLEM IN THE ALTERED PROPORTIONS OF CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS

Between 11 and 14 million German refugees, Catholic for the greater part, are now established in the various zones of Germany. Some have swollen the population of predominantly Catholic regions, and others settling in traditionally Protestant areas now constitute a considerable Catholic element there.

These refugees are Germans who inhabited territories formerly under German domination, which now form part of Poland and Russia. The great exodus started in 1945 when the Russians broke through the German lines. The German population received orders to evacuate so as to avoid falling into Russian hands. Whole towns and countrysides were emptied in a few hours, the fugitives carrying what they could of their possessions on their backs toward an unknown destination. The man who owned a cart was lucky. Since the trains were already uncertain and over-crowded, this mass emigration proceeded on foot. The young who perished from the cold and the aged who succumbed to the excessive rigors were buried at each halting place. Another body of refugees flowed into Germany when the Russians drove out those who had been unable to escape, along with the German "minorities" of the Sudeten and other eastern territories.

This new population found shelter where it could without any organized assistance and mixed into the indigenous populations. The redistribution of Catholics has been so radical that one may no longer speak of exclusively Catholic or Protestant regions.

There are 4 to 5 million Catholic refugees in Protestant regions, distributed approximately as follows: 400,000 in Mecklenburg; 400,000 in Pomerania and Brandenburg; 700,000 in Saxony, 800,000 in Central Germany, 800,000 in Thuringia, 400,000 in Schleswig-Holstein and the region of the Hanseatic cities.

The population has been vastly increased in the Catholic areas: 800,000 at Fulda, 700,000 at Hildesheim, 600,000 at Paderborn, 1,200,000 at Osnabruk.

While there is some possibility of those in Catholic parts finding a

church or a priest, the conditions among Protestants, where facilities for their spiritual needs are almost totally wanting, is disastrous. The situation in the smaller towns is especially acute. Where a small chapel once served a few dozen scattered faithful, there are now thousands. A characteristic situation would be this: a pastor finds himself responsible for thirty villages, averaging a thousand souls each. The pastor, probably old and under-nourished, in order to serve these communities, would need to walk about twenty-five miles on a Sunday, now that bicycles and automobiles have disappeared. Evidently, the task is impossible.

The Protestants have indeed been generous in their efforts to aid this appalling situation. They have put their churches at the disposition of priests and faithful for Catholic services. This has happened even in Catholic regions where churches have been destroyed. The general will to cooperate, marking a radical reversal of German religious sentiment, was in great measure brought about by the enemy of Nazism which they jointly suffered and combatted. In most places the sympathetic spirit prevails during this period of Christian reconstruction.

The difficulties which confront Catholic efforts of reconstruction appear insuperable. The crisis brought about by these Germans of "the diaspora" cannot be overestimated. In their craving for religious life and solace, many have already turned to Protestant services. Material losses have been colossal, mounting in some dioceses to 75%. The clergy has been exhausted by past ordeals, and the former regime has impeded the preparation of youthful forces to assist or substitue for them in the present multiplied duties. While the German Catholics are to be commended upon their courageous efforts at reconstruction, the plight of so many endangered souls imposes itself upon their Christian fellows abroad. (cf. Gioacchino Patti, *Riscostruzione Cattolica in Germania,* in the review Idea, July, 1948.)

CONFERENCE OF WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ON GERMAN REFUGEES

The EPS of Geneva announces a fact-finding conference on the future of German refugees at Hamburg, February 22 to 24, 1949. The Conference is being convened by the Refugee Division of the World Council of Churches, to be attended by representatives of the German Evangelical Church and its relief organization, the German civilian authorities, the German organizations for refugees, and the British division of the Commission of Control, under the presidency of Rev. Henry Carter, C.B.E., Chairman of the World Council of Churches Standing Conference on Refugees. The Conference will consider, in particular, practical solutions for problems of German refugees in the British zone.

ADOPTED PARISHES

During 1948 more than 50 British parishes and colleges adopted German parishes and schools under the Caritas Adoption Scheme. All adopted places are situated in the British Zone of Germany. The Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul in most cases acted as "spear-heads."

SYNOD OF THE EKD ON RECONSTRUCTION

The Synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany, meeting at Bethel, Bielefeld, has drawn up a declaration regarding the refugee problem addressed to "All those who are called upon to help the refugees—church authorities, international relief organizations, administrations, governments and occupying Powers." It calls attention to the destructive ressults of injustice and despair, and implores Germans to cease the illusory hope of a new war as the only way out of their suffering. Peace and honest labor together is pointed out as the real need. It calls upon the Governments' solicitude for refugees. The desperate condition "must be done away with as quickly as possible. But it cannot be overcome as long as those responsible cannot or will not create an economic situation ensuring for the entire population, including the refugees, a level of existence worthy of human beings." Church communities are begged to do all they can for the refugees, and thus bear witness to Christian brotherhood.

The Synod also made bold affirmations about the need for real solidarity between the Eastern and Western sections of Germany where the differences of the religious conditions are in strong contrast.

RADIO-BAMBERG

In mid-January leaders of the Roman Catholic Church and the Evangelical denominations met to draw up the constitution of a Christian broadcasting station in Bamberg. The administrative body would consist of seven representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and seven of the Protestant denominations.

UNDER THE SOVIET

Seven of eight members of the Ermland (East Prussia) Cathedral Chapter have died victims of Communist persecution, according to reports reaching Berlin. The Diocese has become virtually extinct.

Bishop Doepfner of Wuerzburg, Bavaria, on returning from a visit to the Soviet sectors of his diocese, reports close cooperation among Protestants and Catholics there. Catholic population has grown through the influx of refugees, and many Catholic services are being held in Protestant churches. One Catholic priest lives in a Protestant parish house. Hostility to religion persists throughout the Soviet zone.

NEW BISHOPS

The Vicar General of Munster, Mgr. Heinrich Gleumes, has been consecrated second Auxiliary Bishop of Munster to relieve the first Auxiliary, Bishop Roleff. Canon Leiprecht has been appointed second Auxiliary Bishop of Rotenburg (Wuertemberg), as the first Auxiliary, Bishop Fischer, has reached the age of 77.

GERMAN VISIT TO THE U. S.

The U. S. Military Government in Germany is planning to send selected German representatives to the United States for three months to study aspects of American life, including religious activities. The Religious Affairs Branch of the U. S. Military Government hopes to send about 80 Germans, half of whom will be engaged in specifically Protestant projects, the remainder devoting themselves to Roman Catholic or intercredal work. (EPS)

* * * *

HUNGARY

LUTHERAN CONCORDAT WITH HUNGARIAN STATE

An agreement calling for cooperation between the Hungarian Lutherans and the Government was signed in Budapest on December 14, 1948. Bishop Thuroczy who signed for the Lutherans declares, "This is not a treaty nor a business deal, but an honest endeavor of the Church to respect the rights of the State, and of the State to show a reciprocal attitude towards the Church."

A common commission will be formed to issue laws on religion, especially religious education of children. The Government assures freedom of religion. The State will reduce financial support on a sliding scale. The Lutherans yield to the decision of the nationalization of church schools. Teachers will be employed by the State. School-buildings with equipment and funds as well as their properties will become property of the State. (EPS)

* * * *

BULGARIA

ESPIONAGE CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS IN BULGARIA

Fifteen leaders of the Evangelical Church in Bulgaria will be tried on charges of espionage in favor of Great Britain and the United States. The indictment charges are against heads of the Congregational, Methodist, Baptist, and Pentecostal sects.

* * * *

NETHERLANDS

DUTCH ABBEY REBUILT

The famous Egmond Abbey, in ruins for 357 years, restored to the Benedictines before the occupation, has so neared completion in spite of post-

war difficulties that it is expected to be ready for occupation in the summer. The Benedictines will then be able to receive novices for the first time since their return to North Holland.

* * * *

AUSTRIA

ST. STEPHEN'S CATHEDRAL AT VIENNA

The nave of the glorious old Cathedral of St. Stephen at Vienna was re-opened with great pomp by His Eminence Theodore Cardinal Innitzer. It can now accommodate about 7,000 worshippers. The repair of this fine old edifice is largely due to the devotion of the Viennese people to their shrine. Some assistance has come through the sale of St. Stephen's stamps authorized by the government and sold throughout the world.

* * * *

FRANCE

LOAN TO REBUILD FRENCH CHURCHES

A loan is being floated by the French Hierarchy to rebuild the 5,640 churches and 2,500 other religious edifices destroyed or seriously damaged during the war.

* * * *

SWEDEN

NEW LEGISLATION EXPECTED

Bishop Johannes Erik Mueller, Vicar Apostolic of Sweden, says that a new law is pending in Sweden which is to abrogate the restrictions still prevailing against Catholics. Until 1860 Swedish citizens were not permitted to become Catholics. The situation has been greatly modified, but many restrictions remain, especially directed against the establishment of religious orders. It is expected that these will be rescinded. Banns of Catholic marriages must be read in the Protestant parishes, and they must be registered, along with Baptisms, in the Protestant parishes. There are now 12 full-fledged parishes in Sweden wih 33 Priests, and 135 Sisters. The Brigittines, come to life again in this last century, have in recent years succeeded in establishing two houses there, one of which is at Vadstena, site of St. Bridget's original foundation.

* * * *

SWITZERLAND

CATHOLIC POPULATION

Catholics have been flourishing in Switzerland. The situation is vastly different from the Switzerland of 1848 when the radical Protestants gained control of the religious fields. Restrictions still exist, especially on apostolic

activities, for example education and radio managed by Jesuits. At present the proportion of Catholics in Switzerland is 42%. In 1864 the canton of Zurich counted 4 parishes, and now it has 57. Zurich is the chief Catholic city of Switzerland with about 100,000 Catholics. Forty per cent of the population of Geneva is now Catholic. (La Croix)

* * * *

BELGIUM

NOTED CHINESE MONK DIES

Abbot Celestine Lou Tseng-tsaing, O.S.B., titular Abbot of St. Pierre, Ghent, died in Bruges on January 15, at the age of 77. He had been Prime Minister of China twice and Foreign Minister three times. While in the diplomatic service at Petrograd he married the Catholic daughter of the Belgian Ambassador to Russia. Ten years later he made his profession of faith. At his wife's death in 1927, he retired from public life and entered the Abbey at St. André in Bruges. In 1946 the Holy Father made him Titular Abbot of St. Pierre, the first Chinese abbot in the history of the Church.

* * * *

JAPAN

CONVERTS

Every missionary in Japan is baptizing between 100 and 120 converts a year. About 450 priests have entered the country since August, 1945. Each has as many converts as he can manage. These are facts reported by Fr. Bruno Bitter, S.J., former president of the Catholic University of Tokio, on returning to the United States to arrange for a pilgrimage to Japan for the 400th anniversary of St. Francis Xavier's arrival.

NEW MISSION

A group of eight Franciscan Friars of the Atonement from Graymoor, New York, has now reached Japan. They have come to open a mission at Tsurumi in the diocese of Yokahama under the ordinary of that ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Two of these Atonement priests are Japanese.

The Oriental Church

FRIENDLY ENCOUNTER OF RITES

The Most Reverend George Calavassy, Ordinary of Catholics of the Byzantine Rite in Greece, Titular Bishop of Theodoropolis, assisted at a Pontifical Mass in the Mozarabic rite celebrated at Oviedo during his tour of Spain last autumn. The Mass in this magnificent old Spanish rite was celebrated by the Most Reverend Benjamin de Arriba y Castro, Bishop of Oviedo.

Bishop Calavassy celebrated in the Byzantine rite at Oviedo and Gijon. He gave interesting figures on the Greek Catholic Church: At Athens there are 1 Bishop, 9 Priests, 1 Deacon, 18 Panmacarist monks and 4 novices, 1 Minor Seminary with 17 seminarists, 3 seminarians attending the Major Seminary at Rome; 1 editorial press and a periodical; 1 Parish, Catholic Action in all branches; Hospital with beds; *Ekan* (Catholic Association of Young Greek Women), directed by Sisters; University Residence with 25 students without distinction of religion. At Janitza there are 2 Priests and 1 Parish. In Syra, 1 Priest and 1 chapel. Total: 1,200 Catholics of Greek rite in Greece. (Oriente)

* * * *

CITY OF LIBANESE APPRENTICES

Monsignor Thomas McMahon, National (American) Secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, during his recent trip in the Near East visited the *City of Libanese Apprentices* at Hazmie. This institution was founded in 1942 by Father Anthony Corbawi, Maronite Priest, in Beyrouth under the name of *Patronage nôtre Père* for religious and moral instruction, and to give training in the trades of tailoring and shoe-making. This beneficent institution has since grown and has been transferred to a location outside of Beyrouth. This year it comprises various departments: 1. *The Trade School,* where boys are taught in groups of three. One hundred and eighteen pupils are divided among mechanics, carpenters, printers, iron-workers, and book-binders. Ten girls are being instructed in the vicinity under the care of the Sisters of the Sacred Heart in sewing and domestic science. 2. *The Dispensary,* where 60 patients are treated daily. It is expected to become a hospital. 3. *The Group of Little Workers* (girls) which provides social and Christian formation to girls who work in offices. The girls number 75 and publish a Bulletin, *"La Jeune Ouvrière."* 4. *The Press,* publishing the newspaper *A-Chira',* official organ of the Catholic Hierarchy of the Near East, along with the *Bulletin.* This press is preparing a series of Catholic and Social books to be distributed at a low price throughout the Orient. (SICO)

* * * *

RUSSIAN MISSION IN THE HOLY LAND

The Archimandrite Leonid, formerly Rector of St. Gabriel's Church in Moscow (the church which was transferred to the Patriarchate of Antioch), came to Palestine as new Superior of the Russian Mission in the Holy Land on November 23, 1948. The Israeli Government transferred to him all the estates and properties of the Russian Mission, previously controlled by the Archimandrite Anthony, who is in obedience to Metropolitan Anastasy in Munich, and not in submission to the Patriarch. The First Secretary of the Soviet Legation to Israel was present.

PAPAL NUNCIO ATTENDS UNESCO AT BEYROUTH

Archbishop Alcide Marina, Papal Nuncio in Lebanon, represented the Holy See as an observer in the sessions of the United Nationsl Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) held at Beyrouth. For the first time since its establishment, UNESCO officially attended a High Mass which was celebrated on the occasion of the opening of the sessions.

* * * *

SUPPRESSION OF THE CATHOLIC BYZANTINE CHURCH IN RUMANIA

The government decree reads as follows:

"Number 1998. The Presidium of the Great National Assembly of the Popular Rumanian Republic, according to art. 44, point 2, and art. 45 of the Constitutions of the Popuar Rumanian Republic, in view of the decision of the Council of Ministers no. 1,614/1948, publishes the following Decree No. 358 to establish the situation in law of the ex-Greek-Catholic cult:

"Art. 1. Following upon the return of the local communities (parishes) of the Greek-Catholic cult to the Orthodox Rumanian cult and in conformity with art. 13 of the Decree No. 177/1948, the central and statutory organizations of the above mentioned cult cease to exist; that is, the Metropolite, the Dioceses, the Chapters, the Orders, the Congregations, the Archpriestships, the Convents, the foundations, the Associations, as do any other institutions and organizations whatsoever of any nomenclature.

"Art. 2. The movable and immovable goods belonging to the organizations and institutions indicated in art. 1 of the present Decree, with the espress exception of the goods of the ex-parishes, pass to the Rumanian State, which will take them immediately in consignment. An Interministerial Commission composed of delegates of the Ministeries of Cult, Finance, Internal Affairs, Agriculture, Public Instruction, will decide upon the destination of the said goods, having the power to attribute a part to the Rumanian Orthodox Church or else to the various parts of it.

"Bucarest, December 1, 1948.

Signed: C. I. Parhon; Marin Florea Ionescu; Stanciu Stoian, Minister of Cult."

The press has already informed the faithful at large of the unscrupulous ruses and violent brutalities, equalling the most ferocious efforts of barbarism or refined paganism, which have been exercised upon the clergy and faithful to bring about submission to the schismatic Church. The administrative organs of the State, the Communist Party, and the Police, along with the government selected separated hierarchy have cooperated in this outrage against divine rights and human liberties. They think they have destroyed in less than two months the entire Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite which

counted 1 metropolitan see, 4 suffragan episcopal sees, 1,600 priests, and 1,500,000 faithful.

* * * *

EMIGRE RUSSIANS

Followers of Metropolitan Anastasy of Western Europe met in October at Brussels. Thirty-six clerical and lay delegates attended the conference, representing Russian emigré congregations in France, Belgium, Switzerland, England, and Italy. Four delegates came from the United States. The Conference discussed ways and means of fighting atheism and sectarian propaganda. They reaffirmed non-participation in the Ecumenical Movement which they consider as being full of Communist fellow-travellers. The President, Bishop Nathaniel Lvov, affirmed the existence of an underground Orthodox Church in U.S.S.R. which opposes Patriarch Alexis of Moscow. The Anastasius group is believed by Fr. P. de Régis, S.J. (cf. *Contacts with Russian Orthodoxy,* The Month, Nov. 1948), to be the most Orthodox and most friendly group toward the Catholics. Fruitful contacts already exist without any attempt at proselyting propaganda.

* * * *

SEPARATED RUSSIANS OPEN ACADEMY IN U. S.

St. Vladimir's Russian Orthodox Academy was opened on November 4, 1948, in a building belonging to Union Theological Seminary, New York. Columbia University commemorated the opening by a solemn assembly. The Metropolitan Theophilus, Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, Prof. Clarence J. Manning, Prof. Bakhmetev, Dr. Henry Smith Leiper and Prof. Cyril Florovsky were among the speakers. The Academy has 17 students.

Dr. Berger-Vosendorf, an old member of the St. John Damascene Society in Oxford, has accepted a chair of political economy at Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington. Another distinguished member of the Society in America is Rev. Prof. F. Dvornik, D.D., D.Litt., well-known Byzantine and Slavonic scholar, engaged in research at Dumbarton Oaks Institute in Washington. The Cambridge University Press has just published his monumental study, *The Photian Schism,* which is considered by specialists as an outstanding contribution not only to Byzantine Studies, but also to mutual understanding between Catholics and separaed Orienals. (Bolshakoff)

* * * *

METROPOLITAN ATHENAGORAS ELECTED PATRIARCH

Archbishop Athenagoras, the Constantinopolitan Exarch of North and South America, was elected by the Synod in Istanbul to be Patriarch of Con-

stantinople. The Turkish Government agreed to grant him Turkish nationality. Before leaving the United States, the Patriarch-elect visited some of his churches there, which number 300 churches excluding chapels. They also have 300 schools.

The Patriarch visited Paris on January 24 where he was welcomed by the Patriarch of Western Europe, Metropolitan Germanos, of Thyateira, Metropolitan Vladimir, supreme head of the Russian Orthodox Church of the Emigration, affiliated to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and other dignitaries. He had discussions with a representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury come to Paris for the occasion, and with a delegation from the Greek colony. Services were held in the Greek Church and in the Russian Cathedral, where the Patriarch in an address emphasized the importance of Russion Churches to ecumenical "Orthodoxy." He has since been solemnly enthroned as Ecumenical Patriarch at Constantinople.

* * * *

EXARCHATE OF CENTRAL EUROPE DISSOLVED

The Patriarchate of Moscow has decreed the dissolution of the Exarchate of Central Europe, which had its headquarters in Vienna. Archbishop Sergius, the former Exarch, will take up his residence in Berlin where he has been appointed Archbishop. The Russian Exarchate of Western Europe, headed by Metropolitan Seraphim of Paris, is to continue in existence. The parishes of the Patriarchate in Austria are to be transferred to the Exarchate of Western Europe. (EPS)

Book Notes

Prospecting for a United Church. By Angus Dun. xi+115 pp. New York, Harper Bros. 1948. $1.50.

The author is the Anglican Bishop of Washington. He has been interested in church union for many years. For twenty-four years he was connected with the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Massachusetts, a school identified with the extreme "low church" and modernist wing of Anglicanism in America. He treats the subject of Christian reunion from the protestant and modernist point of view. Profoundly concerned by the fatal chaos of conflicting sects calling themselves Christian churches, he tries in this book to "prospect" a path to bring them together. He sees these bodies dwindling before triumphant materialism; and he sees the unbeliever refusing to be interested in a religion which is split into numberless sects that cannot agree as to what true Chrisianity is.

He has three chapters on "How the Churches think of the Church," examining the "Catholic idea," the "Classical Protestant idea," and the "Fellowship of the Spirit or the Community of the Perfect Way." This last is, roughly, the modernist idea, with the orthodox Protestant belief in an infallible Bible.

His remedy for this disastrous chaos would be a united Christendom which includes all these, for he sees each as having valuable features to contribute. A church whose foundation belief is that it is the one church, founded by God Himself, and commissioned by Him to teach mankind what to believe and do in order to be saved, of its nature cannot join in such a "reunion all round." But the author seems not to despair of Catholicism coming to a humbled spirit and abandoning so presumptuous a claim. Many agreeable features of Catholicism could then be welcomed and valued, as could the orthodox Protestant devotion to the Scriptures, and the modernist emphasis on the "spirit." The one thing which would be wholly intolerable is any claim to certain truth, of any infallible teaching, on the part of any of these uniting churches. There could be creeds ("articulated faith," as he likes to call them) provided no one was bound by them; even bishops and priests, provided they are recognized as mere man-made official devices; sacraments, provided they are emptied of their catholic meaning; catholic ways of worship, for those who relish them.

This ideal universal church of the future seems to be very much the ideal of the modernist, "low church" wing of Anglicanism to which the author belongs and into which he seems to be inviting all the rest of the so perversely divided Christians. The position is, of course, fundamentally agnosticism: it abandons any claim to certain truth in religion. It is indeed strange

that anyone can believe that it could appeal to, and win, the men of this materialistic age.

The author has a number of catchwords, such as "costingly," and "togetherness," which rather mark his school of thought and which, along with his frequent use of "shared" and "sharing," have an aroma of Buchmanism.

—H. K. Pierce

* * * *

Unity and Reunion, A Bibliography. By H. R. T. Brandreth. xxii+157 pp. Adam & Charles Black, London, 1945. An annotated and classified bibliography which forms a comprehensive survey of the literature published since the beginning of the nineteenth century on the unity and reunion of divided Christendom, with an introductory summary of the present position. This book accomplishes with admirable thoroughness the bibliography which it has attempted.—S.B.